The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXXI NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 1922 NUMBER 394

Contents

The Week 85
Editorials
Premises of a Russian Policy..... 88
Why a Railroad Strike?..... 89
The Idle Return to Work..... 91
General Articles
Democracy and Our Intellectual Plight.....
.....Dickinson S. Miller 93
How to Spend a Million.....Bruce Bliven 97
Drowned Woman (Verse).....Elinor Wylie 99
Incidental (Verse).....Hazel Hall 99
The Reconstruction of Religion..Herbert Croly 100
Ontario Hydro-Electric.Morris Llewellyn Cooke 102
The Time When I Was Plowing (Verse).....
.....Maxwell Anderson 104
A Communication.....Henry R. Carey 105
Again the Chauve Souris.....Mary Cass Canfield 107
Correspondence 108
Books and Things.....P .L. 110
Reviews of Books
The Limitations of Political Science.....
.....Morris R. Cohen 111
Agonized Adoration.....Royall Snow 113
Kimono .....Nathaniel Peffer 114
Prison Shadows.....Harry Elmer Barnes 115
Country Children.....Dorothy Canfield Fisher 116

The Week

WITH thankfulness and the profound hope that he will not prove to have been mistaken one reads these words of Colonel Haskell's: "We have conquered the Volga famine. Speaking generally, I can say that no one will die of hunger any more in the whole Volga area." If this be true—and there seems no reason to doubt anyone of the levelheadedness of Colonel Haskell—then the worst of what we feared some six months ago will not come to pass, and the hideous shadow of the death of ten million or more people has, for the present at least, been banished. Yet we cannot afford to be complacent over what looks like victory. We helped a good deal, if not as quickly or as generously as necessary. A large portion of the credit must go to the Russians themselves. As Colonel Haskell says: "The Soviets did their share." And, he adds, "I for one am willing to go on record as an optimist on Russia." Part of his optimism he bases on hopes for the coming harvest, which there is reason to believe will be fairly good.

FOR the rest of us, and for the Relief Administration here, optimism is not enough. "Although the back of the Volga famine is thoroughly broken," says Colonel Haskell, "there is still plenty of work to do." Millions, while not actually dying of hunger, are constantly on the edge of starvation. Until Russians get enough to eat, they will be unable to work as hard as will be necessary to break the vicious circle of run-down transportation and manufacturing plant. For some time yet in Russia the thought of food will be uppermost in most minds, and how to get it the great daily worry. "There is an immense amount of medical work ahead." We have prevented a great many deaths, but there remains a great deal of misery and sickness in which we owe a large share of help. The American Relief Administration had planned to withdraw from Russia by the first of September. Now Colonel Haskell thinks it probable that its work will go on till the end of the year. May it continue as long as there remains anything to be done.

THE conditions which the international bankers proposed as a basis for a reparations loan have now been cleared up. They did not presume to pass judgment on the total amount of reparations that Germany could pay and ought to pay. They confined their inquiries to the immediately practical aspects of the question. What annual sums can be extracted from Germany, as interest and amortization on a loan? What assurance can be given that Germany will endeavor in good faith to pay such sums, and that the beneficiaries of the Treaty of Versailles will refrain from additional exactions that will plunge the whole matter into chaos? France was unwilling to give the necessary assurances and therewith the matter was dropped for the time. Nothing but unanimity on the part of the Allies and consent on the part of Germany

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would confer investment value upon a German reparations loan.

FRANCE would get larger actual payments under the bankers' plan than she is likely to get by present methods. But acceptance of the plan would result in exposing the vanity of the London settlement. It would make clear that of the thirty billion dollars charged against Germany, scarcely a third represents a tangible value that any prudent investor would be willing to pay for. The French are aware of the worthlessness of their excess claims on Germany. Yet they insist on keeping them alive against the day when a financial conference is called to consider the whole problem of obligations between nations. If such a conference is called the French will offer to cancel their uncollectable claims against Germany in return for the cancellation of British and American claims against France.

WHEN will the Turkish mess be straightened out? It is safe to say that the prerequisite to its solution is agreement between the European powers as to what ought to be done in that part of the world. The powers have been drifting apart since the war ended and just now they are further apart than ever. Each of them has its own policy toward Turkey. Most of these policies are generally known, but there are spots of deep secrecy. One of them has been revealed by the Christian Science Monitor, whose London correspondent has secured what he assures us is an accurate translation of a secret treaty concluded between Italy and Turkey on March 31st last. According to its terms

> the Italian government consents and undertakes to employ . . . all the effective diplomatic means at its disposal with a view to reestablishing the sovereignty of the Ottoman Empire . . .

The treaty goes on to construe the reestablishment of Turkish sovereignty as chiefly dependent upon the "evacuation by Greece, without any conditions or reservations whatever, of Anatolia," and the return of Adrianople.

THERE are other interesting points. Turkey undertakes "to facilitate the development of the economic policy now being followed and applied by the Italian government in the Balkan States and the Eastern Mediterranean." Italy secures a "most favored nation" clause. Italy agrees to turn over to Turkey eight batteries with munitions, and 10,000 rifles. She obtains the promise of Turkey to prevent disturbance among the Moslem inhabitants of her own colonies. All territory now occupied by Italy in the region of Adalia-Konia will be evacuated on condition that Italy secures economic priority within that region. Altogether this treaty represents the latest step in the process of disagreement between the powers as to Turkish policy, a process leading more and more toward mutual distrust and concealment, toward staking selfish claims as quickly and quietly as possible without regard for the general peace in the Near East. On the whole, though, Italy's policy, as revealed by this treaty, of returning to the Turks the land which is indisputably theirs, is a sensible one.

PRESIDENT HARDING has reason to pray to be delivered out of the hands of his academic friends. It may have given him a momentary pleasure to hear the fervent praise of Dean West of Princeton for his vote as Senator for the anti-strike clause of the railroad bill and his attitude on the bonus. And no doubt the applause of the Princeton audience was pleasing to his ears. But just at present the need of the Republican party is votes, and not Princeton votes, but those of the farmers and workers throughout the country. Emphasis upon the President's anti-strike record will not win votes; neither will emphasis upon his attitude on the bonus. For everyone knows that President Harding was willing to sign a bonus bill, provided that it was accompanied by what he considered an appropriate revenue measure, namely, the sales tax. The bonus is popular in the agricultural districts and the sales tax most unpopular. The bonus is unpopular with "the interests" and the sales tax popular. And the last thing that President Harding must desire is emphasis upon those points in his record that seem to identify his administration with the interests.

AFTER the Indiana and the Pennsylvania primaries, the Iowa primaries provide final proof that the rank and file of the Republican party is dissatisfied with the tendencies of the administration. Of all the candidates Colonel Brookhart was the most distinctively of the opposition. He is against the railway policy of the administration, against the sales tax, and he is a supporter of the bonus. He is regarded as an ultra progressive, well to the left of Beveridge and Pinchot. Yet he carried the field without difficulty. There have been abundant signs in recent months of political unrest in the agricultural states, but no such tangible evidence as the victory of Colonel Brookhart. No wonder that the National Committee is beginning to exhibit concern. Its present strategy appears to be to raise a sufficient campaign fund to work up the organization morale. We believe that the situation requires more heroic measures. An overhaul-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing of the legislative policies of the administration, with a view to counteracting the impression of reaction it has fastened upon itself is the only thing that can preserve the unity of the party.

SENATOR FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey, speaking in defense of the proposed tariff on potteries, says that he has "no desire to create any monopoly or to place any unjust taxation or burden upon the consumers." He merely wants "to protect the workers of my state and see that those industries are properly protected." The duties proposed are 60 percent on plain and 70 percent on decorated chinaware, rates which would not only "protect," but would practically prohibit foreign competition. The high protectionists stand upon their least unreasonable ground when they argue for tariffs in regard to articles which can be as well, or as efficiently or artistically produced in this country as abroad. But it is notoriously true that we have not yet learned to produce china of any artistic value. How can our manufacturers be taught to do so? Surely by a public which keeps on preferring and buying the incomparably better-looking foreign makes. Left to themselves without the example, and, what is more efficacious, the pressure in the market of the superior foreign china, they will continue to turn out mediocre earthenware. If this tariff on china goes through, it will be a gross instance of how "protection for home industries" often means immunity for the inferior, and a monopoly for the ugly.

SENATOR BORAH believes the Dyer Anti-Lynching bill to be unconstitutional, and most good lawyers agree with him. But that a strong case can be made out for the constitutionality of the measure is proved by Moorfield Story's able and eloquent brief in support of it. As laymen we refrain from speculating on what the Supreme Court will do to the measure if it is enacted. We have observed too many instances in which the Supreme Court has found sound reasons where we had supposed there were none for sustaining or overturning an act of Congress. We can at least conceive that after it has completed its wall of defences around property it may exhibit equal ingenuity in constructing a wall of defences around human life. The Dyer act, in itself, would offer very inadequate protection against lynching. It is, no doubt, put forward merely as an entering wedge, in the hope that if it stands the constitutional test more drastic legislation will follow. The need of drastic legislation is obvious enough. It is an intolerable thought that the most hideous atrocities of modern times should be reported, not from revolutionary Russia nor even from Turkey, but from a country of America's pretensions to humanity and enlightenment.

THE Jewish People's Relief Committee has launched a campaign for helping Russia which deserves the consideration of every person whose interest in Russia is humanitarian, not political. The committee, which represents organized Jewish labor in the United States, proposes to raise a million dollars, with which to buy agricultural and industrial tools and machinery for shipment to Russia, where they will serve to equip Jewish co-operatives and individual workmen. The example is one which ought to be followed by other friends of the Russian people. The salvation of Russia lies in the rehabilitation of production, as Mr. Hoover is fond of stressing, and as even the reddest of the Bolsheviki agree. Any group of persons, whatever their political and social views, who will undertake to organize and equip production in Russia may expect to be welcomed, not only by the non-political masses of the population, but by the government also. This is the one approach to the Russian problem which Americans can take and be sure that they will do good and no harm.

IN the New Republic of February 22nd, 1922, an article by Miss Elizabeth H. Ragan (An Eight-Carat Golden Rule) described the "fraternal system of control" in the clothing factory of A. Nash, Inc., of Cincinnati. She reported as facts "claimed to have been elicited" by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers that the Nash factory employed children under age without permit, paid women $12 to $16 a week, and exacted a fine of an hour's pay for a five-minute tardiness. These three charges are flatly denied in a report of a committee of the Federal Council of Churches which made an investigation. The committee "regretfully" comes to the conclusion that "many of the specific charges of the Amalgamated are either inaccurate or greatly exaggerated, and affirms its unshaken confidence in Mr. Nash's sincerity," which was clearly questioned by the Amalgamated and by Miss Ragan. Nevertheless, on a number of rather more important points Miss Ragan and the Council's committee substantially agree. Miss Ragan's article does not contradict the committee's discovery that the average weekly wages were much below the union scale paid in competing cities, nor their advocacy of better pay, nor their recommendation that Mr. Nash's forty-hour week will have little value unless time and a half is paid for overtime, nor their belief that "there should be an adequate organization effected that will insure the workers the election of their own representatives without influence from management."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Premises of a Russian Policy

ENGLAND has a Russian policy. So has France, and Germany. The United States has none. The United States had a policy—a mistaken one, as it turned out—under President Wilson. That policy rested upon the principle of supporting that one of the two contending forces which was assumed to be the more favorable to American international interests and the progress of democracy. The party which President Wilson sought to support was that which still recognized the Constituent Assembly, dispersed by the Bolsheviki, as the true source of authority. It had at least a shadowy reality in the fragmentary "governments" of Archangel and Ufa. Besides, it exhibited a certain amount of vitality, as an opposition party, throughout Russia. President Wilson was deluded into imputing greater strength to it than it had. He would have acted more wisely if he had followed the advice of Colonel Thompson and Raymond Robins, instead of that of Lady Muriel Paget and Professor Bergson. Nevertheless, he was backing an existing party, though a weaker one than he suspected. When he began to realize his mistake he moved toward a readjustment, as his attitude on Prinkipo shows. What further moves he might have made if he had not broken down it is idle to speculate on. Secretary Colby followed slavishly the pre-Prinkipo trend, in spite of its waning promise, and Secretary Hughes has followed the Colby policy down to the present day, although there is nothing left at all of the party it was designed to support. Wilson backed the wrong horse at a time when there was a slight chance that it would win. Hughes is staking his money on the field against the winning horse, after the race has been won.

Therefore it is open to Americans to consider Russian policy from the very first premises. Propaganda aside, what sort of governmental organization is the Soviet government, and how secure is its hold over the Russian people? Is it possible for Americans to have any dealings with a people under the control of such a government? Are there any important interests of America, material or moral, to be subserved by the opening of normal relations with Russia? It is only when Americans have raised these questions and answered them as conclusively as the available facts permit that they can form a fair judgment as to whether Secretary Hughes is justified in his attitude of pure negation.

The Soviet government, in form but not of course in purpose, is a combination of government and political machine, more like the government of New York City, in the intervals between reform waves, than like the democratic structures outlined in our civics text-books. Lenin is boss and chief magistrate combined, Trotzky, Chicherin, Radek, Lunacharsky and the rest are department heads and sachems combined. At the outset the whole machine derived its motive power from the personal activities of its chief, Lenin. If anything had happened to him the Bolshevik government might have broken down completely. Today the situation is changed. A large group of able lieutenants has been trained up, and anyone of them could take the machine over and run it. We surmise that for many months Lenin has carried scarcely any of the actual work of government, since his health has been in a precarious state. But so far as we can see the vigor and efficiency of the government have not suffered. We hesitate to accept the rumors of Lenin's paralysis, because in the past Lenin has been rumored dead, mad, cancerous, tuberculous and what not whenever the requirements of propaganda made such rumors useful. And there are various indications that the propaganda is flickering up just now. We may cite the horrifying tales appearing in the press of the rifling of Romanoff graves to get gold and gems for famine relief. Watch for a broadside from Mr. Gompers and the National Civic Federation! But propaganda or fact, Lenin's disability or even his death would probably have very little effect on the Soviet machine. They doubtless have a new king pin ready. Tammany might conceivably allow the death of a leader to shake the organization, but all Tammany has at stake is the jobs. The Russian governing group has not only its power, but the life of every one of its members at stake.

The Soviet organization has a great deal of stubborn vitality in it, and may be expected to survive through a considerable number of years. That is plainly the opinion of the German and British governments, both of which are in an excellent position to observe Russian events and are equipped with a much better organized foreign intelligence service than our own State Department. It is also the opinion of practically all competent observers who come out of Russia. We may, then, assume as one of the premises of our Russian policy that the Soviet government has a fair degree of permanence, whether we like that kind of government or not.

If that is the case, is it possible for America to enter upon normal relations with Russia at all? Men who like to mix metaphysics with their propaganda are reiterating tediously that as the basis of the Soviet system is communism and the basis of our own system private property, there

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can be no relations between Russia and ourselves. We have heard equally cogent metaphysics on the irreconcilability of Catholicism and democracy, science and religion. In real life Catholics prove good democrats and science and religion coexist. Soviet theory and American theory may be diametrically opposed, but neither the Russians nor ourselves live on theory. In practice the Soviet government makes a great array of concessions to the principle of private interest, and we make a great array of concessions to the principle of community interest. The Soviet government is constantly making new concessions and so are we. Whether in the end there will be enough of a discrepancy to constitute an irreconcilable difference in theory remains for the future to decide. In the meantime private property wheat and corn sustain life very well in Soviet Russia, and communist hides and furs, paper pulp and flax and petroleum would answer our purposes well, if we could get them, or rather, were we willing to take them.

Reciprocal needs exist, whether our theories of life agree or differ. But how can we form permanent relations for satisfying those needs, if, as is alleged, the Soviet government has no respect for its promises? It is worth noting that of the great powers assembled at Genoa the Russians alone were standing on the position that they would not make promises they could not keep. France and Italy have promised the United States to repay their war loans, and have no intention of doing it. The Germans have subscribed to indemnity promises which they know they can not keep. If the Russians had been willing to make equally false promises, they would have secured recognition. Yet it would be foolish to rely on any government's promises, unless there was a basis for confidence in permanent relations of mutual advantage.

Is there such a basis for relations between the United States and Russia? Our pre-war trade with Russia was small. The Germans almost monopolized the Russian market. They had got a footing in the period when Americans had enough to do to supply the domestic market. Today for the first time in our history we might have a chance of securing a footing in Russia, if Mr. Hughes would let us. Still, that is not a vital issue with us.

But there is something else that is a vital issue, if we think of it. There are a great many Russians who will owe their lives to American charity. We have seen the number placed at ten millions. Grant that this is an exaggeration; five millions would hardly be an overstatement. Now, we should like to know what Mr. Hoover, who is responsible for most of those five million lives saved, has in mind in respect to their future. Is he willing to contemplate their loss by starvation next year, or the organization of a succession of relief enterprises? Or is he revolving in his mind some plan of American productive organization, to make further relief unnecessary? All Russia, including the Soviet authorities, are crying for production, as a drouth stricken province cries for rain. And who is so able to organize production as Mr. Hoover?

Mr. Hoover, to be sure, detests the Soviet government, and the Soviet government detests Mr. Hoover. But they have a common interest in those five million lives saved, but needing to be preserved. And if Mr. Hughes could be sent on some honorific mission, say to the Dalai Lama at Lhassa, leaving Mr. Hoover in charge of Russian relations, a way would be found to preserve those lives. Mr. Hoover would grumble a lot, say a lot of unpremeditated and unnecessary things, and stir up a storm of criticism among the friends of Russia, including ourselves, but he would preserve those lives. That is an objective that would give us a Russian policy of our own, a Russian policy worthy of American ideals and traditions.

Why a Railroad Strike?

WHOEVER is responsible for the statement that after the new reductions in wages railway employees will be better off than five years ago is responsible for deception of the public. A fair statement would have been that the decision leaves the railroad men with a lower purchasing power than for by far the greater part of the past twenty-seven years, *with the exception of* 1917. In 1917 prices of food and other necessities were soaring, while wages had not yet gone far on their arduous climb. It is the worst possible base that could be chosen, from the point of view of the men. If one takes account not only of wage rates but also of the volume of employment, which was high in 1917 and is now low, it is doubtful whether the railroad men were much worse off even in 1917.

This is an example of one of the many treacherous difficulties involved in attempting to justify wage reductions on the basis of statistical comparisons with the movement of retail prices. What

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

base ought to be chosen? If not 1917, should it be 1914—a more usual one because it marked the beginning of the Great War? But 1914 was a year of depression, and in the case of the railroad workers, as of many others, the purchasing power of wages was lower then than in previous years. Authoritative statistical studies show that real wages of both railroad and industrial employees reached their peak in 1896, and have shown a declining trend ever since.

Other economic studies indicate that real wages have never been high enough to meet a family budget which the United States Department of Labor describe as the "minimum of health and decency." They show that while real wages have been declining, the productivity per man of railroads and manufacturing establishments has been increasing. Thus while the total income to be distributed has been growing, in part as a consequence of the efforts of these workers, their share of that total has been diminishing. It is difficult indeed to explain the wage reductions on any principle to which the term "justice" can be applied.

Complicated economic arguments will not induce men to accept wage cuts cheerfully when they know by experience they have not enough to live on. People who want the railroad men to accept these reductions are not really moved by the arguments they advance. They are really afraid of the inconvenience and expense of a serious stoppage of transportation. They really believe either that reductions of railway rates are politically expedient or that they will assist a business recovery. But these people do not wish rate adjustments to be made at the expense of the capital invested in the railroads. For such a result might lead to railroad bankruptcy, and railroad bankruptcy would be fatal to private railroad ownership and operation.

The question is, will the men themselves be moved by the same considerations, and is it reasonable to expect them so to be moved? They are, of course, members of the general community, and anything which affects the welfare of the community affects their welfare. They are, like the railroad managers and owners, subject to the Transportation act, and the wage cut was made in the course of the normal procedure established by that law. If the men believed that private ownership and operation of the railroads were in the general interest, if they sanctioned the Transportation act, and if they felt that it had been well and justly administered, they might be expected as loyal citizens to accept the sacrifice now asked of them without resorting to a strike, although they have an apparent legal right to stop work.

Unfortunately for the sake of industrial peace, however, the railroad men believe none of these things. They are heartily and openly in favor of nationalized railroads, and they bitterly opposed the return of the roads to their private owners after the war. The Transportation act was passed over their outspoken protest. After it had become law, the Labor Board was not even created until the wage issue had become so acute that widespread "outlaw" strikes forced the government to offer relief to the men. Since this initial action, so obviously brought about by the exercise of the economic power of organized labor, the status of railway employees has become steadily worse under the regime of the Transportation act and the Labor Board. Wages have been reduced twice. Punitive overtime after eight hours has been abolished for certain classes of maintenance workers, thus bringing about a practical nullification of the eight-hour day. Such decisions against labor have been promptly put into effect by the managements. But decisions in which the Board sought to maintain the previous status of the men have been largely evaded. Roads under federal receivers have obtained legal immunity from the authority of the Board. The Pennsylvania Railroad has by federal injunction prevented the Board from censuring it for disobeying an important ruling. Roads have farmed out shop work to non-union contractors who did not maintain conditions prescribed by the Board, and although the Board has denounced this practice there seems to be no legal way to prevent it.

Numerous other evasions of the Transportation act in the interests of railroad managements have been practiced with impunity. Neither the government nor "the public"—which is apparently another name for the opinion of newspaper editorial writers—has made any noticeable protest against such destruction of the authority of the Board.

These developments have been pricking the railroad workers into a rising frenzy of resentment for the past two years. Close observers believe not only that the returns on the strike ballots will show an overwhelming majority in favor of authorizing direct action, but also that the feeling behind the vote will be so intense that the officials will not be able to disregard it without endangering both their own prestige and the very existence of the organizations. If the officials do not sanction a walkout the men are likely to proceed without offi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cial support. It is difficult to imagine what a leader could say in this situation if he were sincerely opposed to a strike and wished to prevent it. There does not seem to be a single valid argument on the basis of which an appeal to the confidence and cooperation of the men could be made. The only possible plea is that a strike might not be successful, and even this fear will diminish with the approach of a coal shortage and of the season for the movement of crops.

There is just one heroic measure which might avert the trouble, although it is now probably too late even for this to be effective. The wage reduction is not by any means the largest cause of dissatisfaction; it furnishes merely the last of a long series of grievances. If the government could exercise its influence—or even possibly its authority—to induce recalcitrant railroad managements to accept in good faith and to carry out decisions of the Railroad Labor Board in matters of working conditions, and if it could restore the eight-hour day, the workers might be sufficiently placated to lay aside the only weapon which in the past they have found effective. One thing is certain—unless the government does take such action, any attempt on its part to use influence or authority in support of the Labor Board's wage decision will be justly laughed to scorn.

The Idle Return to Work

THE whole history of the present depression furnishes further evidence that our country is much more successful in planning "one-smile-a-day" campaigns and in sounding the note of business optimism than in attending to the problem of unemployment. Our leaders of thought and of action are still in the patent-medicine stage, hunting restlessly for a nostrum, quick, effective and cheap. They do not seem to realize now, as they have not realized in the past, how insidious and enduring are the effects of prolonged and unavoidable idleness on the attitudes of the unemployed. While they, after the manner of the professional purveyors of financial "news," are compiling evidence on the return of business prosperity; the men and women who tramp the streets in the fruitless search for jobs, are acquiring a distrust of American business and political institutions which it will finally require more than a simple palliative to dissipate.

Nowhere has the treatment of unemployment advanced much beyond the experimental stage. But nowhere, also, has there been so much indifference to the problem and so little consideration of it as in the United States. In discussion and in practice, the United States has clung to measures which have long since been discarded elsewhere. In this as in other fields of social legislation, this country retains the well-merited distinction of following far behind other members of the family of civilized nations. Such measures as the quick mobilization of public works, the enlistment of public and private charity, the encouragement of short time and division of work, and advice to employers, which are still so popular here, have been replaced in other countries by comprehensive public programs. As early as 1909 a report by a British Poor Law Commission condemned as humiliating to the workers and wasteful to the community the kind of devices that are still current here, and recommended the adoption of a program in which the responsibility and burden of unemployment were placed unequivocally upon the community and not upon the unemployed. Three years later the scheme of compulsory unemployment insurance became effective. In ten years its scope has been so extended that it now applies to practically the whole industrial working population of England or to nearly 12,000,000 persons. The scheme has obvious shortcomings which have been advertised and criticized. The benefits are too small; the burden of the cost is not allocated with regard to responsibility for unemployment; and the scheme is experiencing rough sledding during this period of severe depression. But whatever its demerits it represents a long step toward the adoption of measures that, it is hoped, will be found to be more nearly adequate. And what is even more important is that the scheme bears eloquent testimony to the willingness of the English government to lay bare the problem of unemployment and to assume at least a share of the burden.

Last September the President's Unemployment Conference had the opportunity to do for the problem of unemployment in the United States what the British Poor Law Commission had done for the same problem in England. In this country there was no coordinated and efficient system of public employment offices. The conscience of the community was not aroused to its responsibility toward the unemployed. Employers engaged operatives when business was good, discharged them when business was bad, and washed their hands of them as soon as they had passed out of their shops. Here surely was the material for a program of action which any intelligent and re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sponsible political administration should have been anxious to propose and to support. The Conference, however, was not a Poor Law Commission. Its recommendations were diffuse and without point. It praised the few manufacturers who had adopted measures of unemployment relief and forgot all about the thousands who had done nothing. In place of proposals for statutory enactment, it gave advice. Where a plain statement of administrative procedure was necessary, the Conference fell into the morass of conflicting economic doctrines. Instead of formulating plans and recommending action, it began to educate. Even in a depression, when evils are severe and the need for relief pressing, education is a slow and painful process.

Now some nine months have passed since the Conference met and adjourned. During this whole period our statistics of unemployment have been no better than they were before. What the unemployed are doing; who and where they are, remains as much a mystery as it has always been. Whether the public works started by the municipal and state authorities have absorbed 5, 10, 15 or 50 per cent of the unemployed is a question that probably no one in this country is in a position to answer. Whether those who still remain unemployed are in distress or are living on their accumulated savings and, hence, on the fat of the land, is a question likewise not capable of satisfactory answer. All that is known is that there were no violent disturbances among the unemployed during the winter and that since December, which was a month of unusually low employment, there has been a steady and substantial expansion in business activity. If the figures of unemployment which were current last winter are at all reliable, this increase in employment during the past five months still leaves an army of unemployed running well into the millions. To the national administration, however, the crisis is over. The Unemployment Conference is congratulated by President Harding on its accomplishments. The "winter of the greatest unemployment in the history of our country" has been passed without a murmur and the national policy of inaction, characteristic of all great periods of unemployment in the United States, has been justified by its results.

In this frame of mind, the administration passes to the next phase of the business cycle, convinced, as always, that they have done well by doing nothing. New agencies for the collection of unemployment statistics have not been created and the old ones have not been improved. Employment exchanges exist where they existed before. Organization of the labor market through a system of exchanges remains no more than a hope. Unemployment insurance is limited to a handful of workers, protected by the benevolence and foresight of their employers, while exceptionally promising proposals for compulsory insurance on a larger scale slumber in the legislatures of Wisconsin and Massachusetts. Senator Kenyon's bill providing for a federal program of public works died in Congress this last winter. Such is the record of achievement for which President Harding praises his administration and congratulates his fellow countrymen.

Such a policy of inaction might be regarded philosophically, if there were any assurance that it will end with the close of the depression. Unfortunately, however, experience has proved again and again that the steps toward unemployment relief and prevention which are not taken during a depression are rarely taken when employment is good and the business outlook bright. Then business men turn to making money and labor to the pursuit of those expensive devices which, to their minds, will assure them more work when the next spell of unemployment comes. It is the same old vicious circle tediously familiar to students of industrial history. A wise and farsighted administration would begin now, when the memory and record of unemployment are still vivid, the formulation of a comprehensive unemployment program and would insist on its immediate adoption. If that were done at least some workers could look into the future untroubled by the constant fear of unemployment that has haunted them in the past.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1922, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. *HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT; ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER;* DANIEL MEBANE, CIRCULATION MANAGER.

EDITORS
HERBERT CROLY — PHILIP LITTELL
ALVIN JOHNSON — ROBERT MORSS LOVETT
STARK YOUNG — ROBERT LITTELL, Assistant Editor

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS
JANE ADDAMS — H. N. BRAILSFORD
BRUCE BLIVEN — JOHN DEWEY
R. H. TAWNEY

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FIVE DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES FIFTEEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS, FOR COUNTRIES IN THE *POSTAL UNION, SIX DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE;* REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Democracy and our Intellectual Plight

I. DEMOCRACY AND MORALITY

A CERTAIN deep-seated vice or weakness of democracy was pointed out long ago. It is that for the individual democracy is uninteresting. Taken by himself alone, he has so little power that it seems to him unimportant whether he exercises it or not. To Frederick or Napoleon the business of government was interesting. It was creative work on a colossal scale. He could see his own strokes shaping a nation. His material, of course, was more or less intractable but still it again and again was fashioned to his purpose. To govern is, for a despot, an exciting occupation. To exercise the elective franchise of a single citizen under democracy is not exciting. Nothing can make the citizen believe that it is a vital matter whether he, as a single unit, casts his vote or not or even for whom he casts it.

It has often been said that this want of interest would be remedied under civic socialism; for there the government would be controlling interests so close and vital to every citizen that he would have to give his attention. No doubt the degree of attention would be increased, but the vice or weakness would still exist, for it would be yet more painfully evident to a citizen how little power he had by himself to control the affairs that concerned him. He would be but one of innumerable stockholders. The obstacle is more deeply lodged in the nature of democracy than this suggestion realizes.

Now the curious thing is that there is a very similar vice or weakness in the scheme of morality. May it not be that the means by which this weakness has been met in morality is the very means required to meet it in democracy?

In morality what is in question is not the power of the individual but the power of the individual act. Morality exists for the welfare of society and for that only. But an individual cannot be made to believe that one particular lie or one unobserved petty theft or one small and unpunished breach of contract will do any great harm to society. He admits at once that if everybody did the like society would suffer. Indeed, he sees that if he on every occasion did the like society would suffer, not to mention himself. But that is not the case in question. The case in question is the single act. If he measures by consequences, his common sense tells him that what he does in such a particular case is often not very important.

Now what has morality done to meet the difficulty? I call it a difficulty because when the particular cases accumulate and we have many cases, lying, theft, breach of contract do injure society and it is important to suppress them. Morality introduces one of the most momentous of ideas, the idea of the sacred. It says truth is a sacred thing. It says honesty and contract are sacred things. It puts a peculiar stigma of discredit and disgrace, quite apart from the thought of consequences, on those who disregard the taboo. To make a moral law take effect and secure a volume of good consequences it is necessary to give it a certain prestige and majesty, to make it "inviolable", to secure in its favor a dumb, uncalculating instinct of obedience. Unless people make up their minds to obey the rule always they will not obey it even enough for wholesale purposes. The rule must be sacred.

To be sure, this state of things is not fully realized in morality. The taboo is there but it is not always obeyed. It does not matter, however, for our argument, just how far it succeeds. The taboo does work powerfully toward getting the law more uniformly obeyed and obedience is sadly needed for the general welfare.

If we follow the same clue as to democracy we should endeavor to make the citizen's exercise of his elective franchise a sacred duty. Public opinion in a well constituted democracy would attach discredit and disgrace to the omission of civic duty or of anything that it involves. The organs of society most immediately charged with the office of teaching this civic morality and training conscience are the school and the church. The best available source of influence upon the school and the church is the college. At present there is on this point little or no public opinion that makes its pressure felt and its disapproval sting.

This is the first conclusion suggested; but it must be amplified a little. We may say that there are two groups, the enormous group consisting of all voting citizens and the small group consisting of elected officials, members of legislative bodies, etc. We may call them the inner group and the outer group. Now, strange to say, the vice or weakness that impairs the outer group as ultimate repositories of civic power impairs also the inner group as agents or instruments of that civic power. We find in the representatives the same vice or weakness that we find in the represented.

Anyone who has had to do with committees, boards, legislative bodies of any sort knows this.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The power of the individual is small. He can do nothing except by convincing others. And the difficulty of moulding opinion by words becomes a too familiar fact. The etiquette and propriety of such a body calls for courtesy, modesty, reticence, caution, dignity, amiability, and the like. These obstruct the individual's standing out for the interest of those whom he represents. That is, the etiquette and propriety of the occasion tend to be determined by the comfort and convenience of the inner group who are present, not by the interests of the outer group who are not present but whom the inner group exists solely to represent. Pages of the New Republic could be filled with examples, taken from the procedure of "best citizens." It is often precisely the "best citizens" who most feel the ethics of the inner group and forget their duty to the outer group. The power of the individual being small, it seems not worth while to make a great effort to exercise it.

What has been said of the larger group applies then to the smaller. The duty of the representative to the represented could take to itself the emphasis of a "sacred duty." The alternative of a moral esteem or a moral discredit could attach to it.

II. DEMOCRACY AND LOGIC

We have seen that the natural interest of the governor in government is sadly reduced under democracy because one vote at the polls or one voice in council accomplishes so little. Now this interest is reduced in another way. Democracy is government not by force but by discussion. The ideal of democracy is that the reasonable idea, the reasonable proposal, should conquer by its reasonableness. According to this ideal there would still be possible for strong minds and characters the interest of great creative work. Whoever conceived or popularized the right ideas would carry these ideas into law by influencing the fair minds of the electors. The thinker or the popular leader would have power by the truth of his ideas. He would become in a sense an effective governor in a new way, by the power of right reason. Hence he would have incentive. Such is the ideal of democracy. Instead of this we see the incentive of the thinker and sound leader brought down to a minimum because truth is not mighty and (for an indefinite length of time) does not prevail. There is no free passage for ideas into the popular mind, but perpetual obstruction.

Now is there such a thing as logical education? Can citizens be trained in the elementary habits of the fair mind? Can these elementary habits be stated as a simple technique? I cannot help thinking that they can. Can minds of average intelligence be drilled at school in this technique? I believe so. Does any form of education now produce this result—or aim at this result? I believe it does not. Would this teaching remove the colossal mental obstruction to intelligent democracy? It would gradually and steadily reduce it.

"I don't know anything about logic," said an accomplished graduate of Cambridge University. Logic is a "highbrow" subject, put in a historical scholar who was present. Unhappy fact, if fact it be; for logic is an indispensable basis of an efficient democracy. No manipulation of blind feelings and impulses will serve the purpose. No adjustment of "interests" will do, for the evil is that voters will not vote according to their interests.

The actual nature and use of logic have been so distorted by that singular excrescence called a text-book of logic that we are put to it to see what they really are.

There is only one force that makes a bad mind out of a good one or a tolerable one, a force that has been able to accomplish this result in the majority of civilized minds. That force is "the will to believe"; more fully expressed, the willingness to believe on insufficient evidence, because the belief is attractive, or the opposite unattractive, or the labor of further thinking unattractive. To believe by attraction instead of believing on test, that is the temptation. To teach the tests, that is the business of logic. The effectual principles of logic are simple. The first principle of logic is the principle of objectivity; that is, that you do not carry the tests in yourself, that they are objective. The human mind has got upon firm ground just in proportion as it has escaped from its own plausibilities to objective tests. The will to believe takes the guise of certain fallacies that we are ever encountering, fallacies easily listed, easily exposed, the essence of which is that they beg the question of objective evidence and fall back on other recommendations to belief. The only difference between them lies in the nature of the other recommendation on which they fall back. The prevailing errors in reasoning, responsible for most of the harm of false conclusions, are *obvious* errors. We should all see and avoid them except that we are looking the other way. Fallacy, like the juggler, distracts our attention. To turn our heads round and make us look straight at the obvious principle we have ignored is the business of logic.

You will not make men thinkers, you will not make them thorough analysts; these arts are born of a temperamental bent; but you can make the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

growing mind learn to observe certain rules. They are not so difficult to learn as spelling. They are about as difficult as grammar. It must be remembered that *one* of the most important of the rules is mere caution in coming to a conclusion. Suspension of judgment till the tests are met requires to be inculcated and practised.

All this is abstract because it must be brief. Abstraction, as always, is shorthand.

Logic is not the correct reasoning process; it is not the way the mind moves when it moves rightly. There is not in the human mind a track or tramway called logic on which thought moves correctly and from which it should not be "derailed." Logic does not at all treat of the reasoning process; that is, the actual mental process by which we pass to new knowledge or opinion. Psychology does that. All minds pass in the same way to new knowledge or opinion. There is only one reasoning process. That is the association of ideas. One idea suggests another. All minds jump to conclusions or creep to conclusions by suggestion. "The method by which the fool arrives at his folly" is one with that by which the wise man reaches his wisdom. Logic is something quite different. It is an attempt to formulate the *tests* by which we discover whether our new idea is warranted, whether we have jumped to a safe conclusion. Logic has found, and found from human experience, that certain conditions are observable under which coming to a conclusion is safe and the conclusion will not have to be abandoned; and other conditions under which it is unsafe and untenable. Logic draws up these tests in certain rules. These rules never say, "Think thus and thus, put one foot before another thus and thus in your process of thought." That would be futile; we can only think in one way. They tell you how to test the conclusions of your thought after you have got it. They say, Observe whether the evidence, the data, fulfill certain conditions. If so, then go forward.

To draw up a list of prevalent fallacies, to give them suitable names, to gather instances of each, to show in each the presence of the will to believe, to point out the objective test that has been disregarded, this is the simple task of logical education. It is far simpler and more vital than the text-books of logic. Logic is essentially "the fight against fallacy." Its life is in dealing with cases. It must teach us to define terms and remain true to our definitions. It must strengthen our faith in common sense when we judge of experiment and observation. It is indeed nothing but formulated common sense. It need not bother us with syllogism or the details of inductive methods—need not if its object be to arm the average citizen against fallacy. It is a brief and simple discipline in its maxims, but demands practice. It can never be imparted by lectures, only by drill.

Compare the expert with the average man. The expert knows by tests outside himself and has no desire but to abide by them. Anyone can sway his mind. If a child brings him a new fact that child can transform his judgment. His judgment is hung like scales to be delicately responsive to facts from without. The average judgment is caught in some obstruction and rendered immovable. It seems often to rejoice that nothing you can say, no fact you can bring, will affect it. Logic is a social bond. It forcibly opens our minds to each other when without it they would be closed and barred.

This social bond being largely absent, democracy miscarries; the community is not guided by its own real welfare; it is guided even at the best by spells and attractions. In 1893 Mr. Shaw wrote as follows: "The chief difficulty in dealing with Mr. Gladstone as a statesman arises from the fact that his statesmanship, such as it is, has nothing to do with his popularity. A man must be a skilled citizen, so to speak, to appreciate statesmanship; and our electorate does not include one per cent of voters who have skilled citizenship enough to know whether Mr. Gladstone is a real statesman or not. It is as an artist, an unrivalled platform artist, that Mr. Gladstone is popular. Jefferson's Rip Van Winkle never attained the vogue of Gladstone's Grand Old Man. Every touch of it delights the public. The tree-felling, the lesson-reading, the railway journeys punctuated with speeches, the feats of oratory and debate, the splendid courtesy and large style, the animated figure with the blanched complexion lighted by the great eyes, the encyclopaedic conversation, the elastic playing with an immense burden of years: all these bring rounds of applause louder and longer than any merely theatrical actor can hope for. Mr. Irving in the Lyceum is but the microcosm: Mr. Gladstone in England is the macrocosm. The parallel is close in every respect except that of magnitude. Mr. Irving is deservedly so popular as an artist that it is unpopular to deny that he is a connoisseur in literature as well. And Mr. Gladstone, too, is so popular as an artist that it is unpopular to deny that he is a great political thinker as well." Just so, it may be added, Roosevelt's "Livest Man in America" had a phenomenally long run. He had undeniably some of the attributes of a sagacious statesman, but it was not his statesmanship, it was his fascination as a public figure that gave him, in the opinion of historians, the greatest following any individual in this country has had.

Again, everyone knows that the successful man-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ager, whatever his office, is prone to resort to certain wiles in guiding other men in council, simply because they cannot be swayed by sound argument alone. He touches with a sure, light hand upon their self-interest, prejudice, vanity, dread of ridicule, indolence, etc.; he is thus able to bring about a good result which he cannot so surely or swiftly effect by reasoning. Mr. Lloyd George has for the most part to deal with minds inflexible, unfair and blind to his situation; his amazing success is due to his acute study of these minds, not chiefly to the truth of his ideas. In general "politicians" are produced by the mental state of the people who pour contempt upon them; at all events by a state of mind of which theirs is a fair specimen. Academic thinkers have little in their work to make them realize the parallelogram of the forces with which a statesman is in actual contact. Statesmanship, as Mr. Ellis Barker has pointed out, is taught in no university. Statesmanship in our present democracy is largely the thankless and baffled art of dealing with irrational forces.

Democracy, we say, wishes to substitute for the sway of despots the sway of true ideas. Nothing could be more remote from the actual state of democracy—or of human cooperation at large. "Those who govern," says Franklin in his Autobiography, "having much business on their hands, do not generally like to take the trouble to consider and carry into execution new projects. The best public measures are therefore seldom adopted from previous wisdom [that is, from previous reflection] but forced by the occasion." Unconsciously echoing Franklin, Mr. Wells remarks that people in prominent positions cannot do any work, meaning any thorough reflective examination to find out what would be the true policy. The people do not demand or recognize such thorough insight into the means of securing their welfare. Disraeli's character Sybil "found to her surprise that great thoughts have very little to do with the business of the world; that human affairs even in an age of revolution are the subject of compromise." Bagehot remarks in his masterpiece, Sir Robert Peel as a Statesman, that the modern statesman is a man of common ideas though of uncommon abilities. The modern democratic community is not organized to give free passage to correct ideas, but is such as to obstruct their circulation. What we need, then, is free mobility for sound ideas such that the originator or formulator or preacher of them will have this incentive, that his ideas may prevail. Such a relation between minds can be secured by elementary logical education only, which is the abc-training of a fair and open mind. We are sufficiently remote from any such consummation. The teacher, however, sees his efforts begin to tell at once.

This conclusion seems doctrinaire, academic, remote from life, only as long as we do not see a few guiding principles that can be disengaged from the wilderness of mental detail.

III. LOGIC AND MORALITY

It appeared above that the citizen's governing function should be regarded, for reasons given, as a sacred duty. We then saw that this duty could not be performed to good purpose without an elementary training in logic, or in other words, in fairness of mind. Very well, a part of the civic duty, a part of the sacred thing, will be to observe the rules of a fair mind. To serve the general welfare is what morality is for; the duty to observe the plain rules of safe inference is not only a part of morality, it is the most momentous part, for it has the greatest effect upon welfare. There is, in fact, no more abject weakness in our intellectual state than its propensity to forget that morality is not a mere blind taboo existing for its own sake, but a means to an end, by which end it must be measured and shaped; that its sole business is to avert misery and produce well-being. A state of ideas in which this is not recognized remains primitive and barbarous; when education recognizes it we take the step across into a civilization aware of the possibility of controlling its own fate. Our present morals lay stress on the control of self, but not on the control of events. The general happiness, however, depends on the control of events. And this depends upon intelligence. To be as intelligent as possible becomes a central part of morality. We think of the acts of statesmen and of electors under the categories of opinion, which is free to all, of judgment, good sense, shrewdness or their opposites. We must be taught to think of them also under the categories of morality.

IV. DEMOCRACY AND THE INTELLECTUAL CLASS

The intellectual class is apt to feel somewhat thus: "Oh! If the populace could only be like ourselves, if only we knew of some way of making them intellectual!" "The thinking portion of society" laments its impotence to spread its own standards amongst the multitude. But is it not possible that the difficulty lies with that class itself? Is it not possible that the sound standards of the intellectual class are—missing; that it is in that very class that the abc-training of the fair mind must begin?

If we wish to employ a first-rate surgeon, civil engineer or sanitary engineer we know how to find him. We do not for this have to understand surgery or engineering. We can find the experts

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because people agree as to who they are. Such an agreement exists because, in a sufficient measure, the experts agree amongst themselves. And this because there are, within these several professions, definite tests by which achievement is measured. The case is typical. We find a large measure of consensus, we find recognized guides, in any subject in which the tests of achievement are recognized. If then you wish in a given subject to have recognized experts, secure within it the application of definite tests. This was the principle of John Stuart Mill. It follows that the intellectual portion of society would have authority and would lead, in things political and social, if it did its own work well enough, if it could develop that intellectual conscience which is mindful of the tests that alone protect us from arbitrary opinion and bring us to objective success.

In other words, the reason why the intellectual class does not possess a greater influence over affairs, the reason why it must so generally sit on a hill and watch the tide, is that it is not intellectual enough, that it lacks seriousness, self-criticism, a sense of responsibility, is self-indulgent and lets itself go in its thinking, that hence it is wanting in objective grip and lingers in a state of mental nonage. In a word, it lacks discipline. This is at once effect and cause of the fact that our education, including our higher education, does not impart such discipline. Nor does the world of printed discussion, "the republic of letters," give it. For example, there is a prejudice against detailed destructive criticism, such as Macaulay's review of Gladstone, or James Mill's of Mackintosh, or John Mill's of Sedgwick, Whewell, or Hamilton. But precisely so far as a subject, such as political and social science or ethical philosophy, is removed from experimental test, it requires that we shall be resolutely and persistently reminded of the obvious principles of common sense and caution, which, for all their obviousness, in our self-indulgence we persistently forget. A watchful and searching criticism becomes the chief means of applying the logical pressure which the immediate verdict of facts, the brute force of palpable refutation, no longer applies. Such criticism is but a form of that logical education the essence of which is the systematic exposure of fallacy. Speaking of Mill on Hamilton, an acute reader once remarked: "It wasn't that Hamilton was so bad, but that for once a book got reviewed." We have to be reminded by something outside ourselves, whether it be experiment or another and vigilant mind, of the dangers to which easy thinking is always exposed.

The conclusion is that the reforming efforts of the intellectual class should begin at home. The education to affect is first of all that given in universities. The persons to effect it are university teachers. The person to begin is—any teacher; provided he has had the requisite education himself, or is willing to give it to himself; to turn deliberate heed upon the humble principles of "fair play" in coming to conclusions. What is most needed is a practical text-book. The first step toward making the simple technique of honest thinking, the morals of the mind, effective amongst the multitude, is a potent step; to set it at work at the points from which, according to the principle of Mill already stated, the most powerful radiations are capable of spreading.

DICKINSON S. MILLER.

How to Spend a Million

WE reveal ourselves in our day-dreams, so the Freudians say. If this is true, I have in my possession a group of documents produced at my request by several hundred people, which ought to cause any disciple of Freud to grin with delight. They represent a cross-section through the minds of a number of those individuals who so infrequently get a chance to break into print and let us know their inward thoughts—the plain people, in fact, on whose behalf editors always profess to be writing and of whom they often know so little from personal contact.

It happens that some months ago I was one of a group of people consulted by a wealthy gentleman on an unusual quest. This person is planning to devote a large part of his substantial fortune to advancing the welfare of humanity in some way, and at that time was puzzled as to the wisest procedure. He is not interested in ordinary charity, which seems to him all too ineffective even when it seeks only to palliate. He does not wish to advance any "ism," economic or religious. After studying the history of a number of foundations created by wealthy men, he has the liveliest doubts of the ultimate efficacy of such enterprises. In short, he sought some type of expenditure which would be permanent in results, would aid the whole community instead of any single class, and if possible, would be self-perpetuating, either earning its way or inducing additional contributions by other wealthy men, or both.

This is a difficult set of conditions, and the group called in consultation proved infertile of ideas. With the permission of the perplexed philanthropist, I therefore explained his problem in the columns of a daily newspaper, the New York Globe, and invited the readers of that paper to aid him.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The replies came down at once on my devoted head, like the celebrated water at Ladore; before the week was out I was inundated almost past rescue. Hundreds of letters rolled in; scores of willing advisers telephoned, while the more importunate called on me in simultaneous regiments. Inventors brought patented machines wrapped in oilcloth, and set them up in my office despite all expostulation. The gentleman with a rock drill regretted that my floor was too soft for an adequate demonstration. The architect with a model town plan would have built me a cardboard village if my room had only contained a bare space 40 x 40 feet. The single taxers, alone, handed in enough pamphlets, if stacked in one unreadable row, to reach from here to bedtime.

As was of course to be expected, any number of contributors to the symposium violated the rule barring private charity. You don't get the ear of a millionaire every day, if you are a Schenectady machinist with tuberculosis or a Brooklyn school teacher unsuccessfully trying to support your aged parents. It was a gentleman in Pennsylvania who trustfully sent in photographs of his five daughters, valedictorians for five successive years at the local high school, in the hope that their youthful beauty would reinforce his argument that he should be endowed with a farm in Texas. At least half a dozen spinster ladies pled for funds with which to retire to the country and bring up other people's children. Eleven-year-old violinists and singers wanted an education in music. Beggars of all the usual varieties sent in their standard letters.

Omitting these, however, there were still several hundred bona fide suggestions, produced by purely altruistic souls who could hardly themselves be beneficiaries of the plans they proposed. Almost one letter in three asked that money be used to finance the building of small homes for working people who are now at the mercy of rapacious landlords. In not a single case did these suggestions involve charity. They all proposed repayment over a term of years, usually mentioning a definite rate of interest, ranging between three and eight percent. The desire of the city-dwelling tenant in another man's house to get his feet on a bit of his own ground was perhaps the most striking fact developed by my inquiry.

Next in popularity was the idea that money should be lent to young people to enable them to complete their education, these funds to be returned in installments after the individuals so aided had begun their careers. A number of persons also suggested financial aid to adult literary and artistic geniuses, freeing them for a productive period of a few months or years, the loans to be repaid out of the subsequent value of their work.

Quite a number of correspondents wanted to see a "completely honest" newspaper established "to print the truth which is suppressed today." Others proposed an agency of investigation which would sift the facts involved in any important national situation, such as a strike, and publish its findings for the intelligent guidance of "all-important" public opinion. The subsidization of pure research in several branches of science was also proposed by a number of persons.

Some of the scattering shots are worth recording. Each of the following ideas was proposed one or more times:

Fresh pure milk for babies.

Training for young people through social and recreational clubs in every city, non-sectarian, non-religious but providing "a good atmosphere."

Employing ten or twenty competent men to ferret out and expose those who sell fraudulent securities.

Creating an international university in a small American town, and bringing over to it starving scientists from Europe.

Purchase of a tract of wild, wooded land as a demonstration forest to be operated by a college.

Periodic physical examinations for everybody, free of charge.

Making of educational motion picture films to be supplied to schools at cost or free.

Purchase and distribution of artificial limbs for poverty-stricken cripples.

A newspaper advertising campaign on behalf of the League of Nations.

The dissemination of knowledge about birth control.

Creation of a training school for parenthood.

The purchase of idle land upon which able-bodied unemployed men could be put to work as farmers.

Endowment of a good band to give free concerts in small towns all over the country.

Elimination of commercial prostitution and venereal disease.

Establishment of a research laboratory to settle the problem of life after death.

Purchase of books for the shelves of Carnegie libraries.

Establishing a colony of American and West Indian Negroes in Africa to teach various industrial arts to the natives.

The abolition of war (the proposer unfortunately neglecting to explain the proper method).

A foundation which would permit overworked mothers to get several weeks' vacation in the summer—*without* the children.

Lectures in various arts and sciences to be delivered without cost by radio telephony.

I might add that an astonishing and alarming fact about these letters (to one who earns his living by writing editorials) was the ease with which the writers caught the exact tone of amiability, cocksureness and omniscience which distinguishes all our best leader writers. Eight out of ten of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these contributors seemed quite competent to go to work on the editorial page of the Times tomorrow. If the quality of notepaper and the characteristics of handwriting are a safe guide to a writer's social and financial status, the degree of perfect assurance, of complacent self-confidence, increased as one went lower in the scale.

If these contributions may be accepted as a basis for deduction (I don't know whether they may or not, but having determined to get an article out of them, I shall proceed on the assumption) there is no widespread objection to paternalism among the citizens of our republic. Their vaunted native independence may cause them to scorn a boost up the ladder; but if so, they manage to conceal the fact. A good half of the suggestions were purely eleemosynary. To be sure, those who asked for personal assistance were always careful to request no more than a loan; but then!—even the battered hulks who hang about a newspaper office and pick up a dollar when they can, are punctilious in promises "to return it next Tuesday morning sure."

Another point which interested me was the small number of persons who wrote in to challenge the whole idea. I had expected that a great many critics would declare the conditions impossible; and I am by no means sure that they would not be right. Everyone—or nearly everyone—knows that our social system which piles great sums into the hands of a few individuals, is so devised that it is extraordinarily hard for them to expend their money again with the sure consciousness that they are sowing good seed. Yet only one or two persons of my hundreds took the trouble to write in agreeing with "L'Inconnu Femme," who said:

> Why waste valuable columns telling any millionaire how to spend his money? Do you think you can in the first place?
>
> A millionaire and his money are not soon parted, but think, dear editor, of what valuable use you could make of that space in telling us poor devils who are trying to keep a roof over our heads, even if the water does leak through every room, how we can get jobs, we who seem to have so many talents, brains and intelligence.

The other characteristic which stands out in almost every one of these communications, as may be noted in the list above, is complete impracticality. Perhaps this is a quality peculiarly intense in those who write letters to newspaper editors (though many of my correspondents stated that this was their first offense). They seemed to possess in common an amiable fuzzy-mindedness, a vague and useless but appealing warmness of heart. I say "useless" because it would seem that anyone who had ever come within three miles of a millionaire, or for that matter had even studied his alleged characteristics in the movies which specialize on portrayals of Croesus, must have realized the flat impossibility of embarking on the sort of enterprise proposed by at least fifty percent of the helpful altruists.

I know I ought to draw a solemn-sounding series of philosophical conclusions from the deplorable failure of my quest to produce workable ideas; but I am entirely unable to do so. After all, perhaps the conditions were too rigid. Most people have little opportunity to give advice on the spending of a large sum for a philanthropic purpose. We all day-dream about what we would do if we were millionaires; but these reveries are chiefly directed, I suppose, toward yachts, wine-cellars and harems. Possibly the results I have recorded point to the necessity for adding to the curriculum of every school a course in spending money beneficently; or possibly they point to nothing whatever.

BRUCE BLIVEN.

Drowned Woman

He shall be my jailer
Who sets me free
From shackles frailer
Than the wind-spun sea.

He shall be my teacher
Who cries "Be brave."
To a weeping creature
In a glass-walled wave.

But he shall be my brother
Whose mocking despair
Dives headlong to smother
In the weeds of my hair.

ELINOR WYLIE.

Incidental

How can I rid me
Of what is not mine—
This self that was youth's,
This song swift and fine
That wraps me with fire,
And yet is not mine?

Song to be seemly
For her that is I,
Is song low with sleep
To be hummed in a sigh,
As I weave cool reason
Out of sounds that go by.

And who would be wanting
Song not her own,
Though it warms with warmth
The sun has not known,
When she might be thinking,
And cold and alone?

HAZEL HALL.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Reconstruction of Religion

THIS book of Mr. Charles Ellwood* consists of an exhaustive argument in favor of religious reform and a vigorous plea for a religious revival as the only possible means of restoring the morale and perhaps of saving the life of modern society. Civilization, according to Mr. Ellwood, needs saving. It is in a bad way. As the democratic peoples know it, it is derived from Christian sources, yet for many years prior to 1914 it tended in practice towards the abandonment of Christian ideals. The Great War was the culminating result of this tendency. Anti-Christian politics, anti-Christian business, and anti-Christian ideals of life rather than pressure of population upon material resources, geographical conditions, or biological necessities connected with race were the real causes of the sufferings and calamities of the last few years. Germany merely brought to a focus the anti-Christian forces in modern civilization. She took the lead in re-paganizing the world.

The relapse into paganism characterized personal as it did political and business morals. The novel contributions which the last two centuries have made to the mechanics of living have stimulated and rationalized the selfish in the sense of the acquisitive impulses of human nature. The Christian Church itself became subtly affected by the egocentric tendencies of the times. "Not transformation of this world but escape from it became the Christian message; not social leadership but protest the function of the Church." The ruling classes have professed a conventional Christianity, but they rarely permitted it to interfere with the pagan "mores" which dictated their practical behavior. In all countries and in practically every relationship discord both of purpose and method paralyzed the efforts of individuals or groups which were seeking social amelioration. Good men emphasized their differences and, instead of pulling together, pulled apart. But the enemies of social cohesion could not help but unite in their work of disintegration. Their power during and after the war overwhelmed the social forces which still made for understanding and goodwill. The western peoples are swinging back towards the barbarism of irreconcilable national and class conflict which, unless it is overcome, will result for many generations in increasing human misery and frustration.

The growing paganism of modern society is not due to any peculiar perversity in the men of today as compared to the men of yesterday. It is the result of a change in the comparative energy of different human incentives and in the conditions of human labor and achievement which an enormously increased knowledge of the natural world has brought about. The new science, technology and industry have upset the balance of individual and social life of which the older moral codes and religious institutions were the expression. Modern society has released and enriched with momentum drawn from the air, the water and the earth, certain insistent individual and class interests which speedily became strong enough to mould the policy of the state and which associated the democratic and liberal ideals with their own unhampered satisfaction. The success which the new individualistic and class industrialism and specialism won by virtue of its alliance with natural science has undermined the authority of the older Christianity. The traditional moral and religious standards were not attacked but they were evaded and ignored; and this combination of nominal loyalty with actual indifference to the conventional fabric of the Christian morals is one of the most dangerous aspects of the crisis. It has disguised and concealed the sheer barbarism of the authorized behavior of individuals and groups in relation to the most characteristic political and industrial activities of today.

Modern society cannot, according to Mr. Ellwood, remain as it now is, partly pagan and partly Christian. Science has enabled the surviving paganism in western civilization to become aggressive. Unless Christianity begins a counter-offensive, it will steadily lose ground. The democratic peoples must speedily become more Christian, or they are bound speedily to become more pagan. Yet a reversion to paganism would involve industrial bankruptcy, scientific obscurantism and social dissolution. It would mean a world reduced to a dead level of individual expediency, destitute of disinterested enthusiasm and comprehensive vision, distracted by self-righteous violence and paralyzed for excellent achievement by uncertainties and conflicts of fundamental conviction. Only in one way can modern society save itself from losing its way in such a moral jungle. It must accept, assimilate and institute as an authoritative and comprehensive guide to life a religion which is compatible with the truths of modern science, and which is capable of using the increasing knowledge of the natural and the human world to move in the direction of an ideally complete human society consisting of all humanity.

Christianity, he thinks, is capable of becoming such a religion. At present it is retreating and is fighting a rear-guard action with an aggressive but furtive paganism. The blindness and the indifference of the majority of Christians to its infirmities renders its position peculiarly and unnecessarily dangerous. They are not aware of the retreat and the conflict and do not realize how far paganism and secularism have undermined the authority and the sincerity of popular Christianity. If the Christian faith is to reassert its earlier formative influence upon the life of the individual and society, it must consciously seek and prepare for reconstruction. The leaders of the Christian Church will have to transform traditional Christianity from a theological into an ethical monotheism and its consciousness of the ultimate Christian reality from a metaphysical into a social and scientific truth. They need to discard their doctrinal and theological differences, emphasize the social and ethical meaning of their religion and press scientific method into the service of their moral and social aspirations. The Church should throw its supreme emphasis upon the love of and loyalty to the great community—humanity as a whole. A religious devotion to the great community is, in Mr. Ellwood's opinion, no impracticable motive and it consecrates its devotion to no impossible task. "A Christian world is not only practicable; in the long run it will be found that no other sort is practicable."

Mr. Ellwood's thesis is interesting in relation to the history of sociology. Writing in the interest of social welfare, he, as a professor of that science, returns to the idea of social progress as the function of an essentially human-

* The Reconstruction of Religion—Charles A. Ellwood, Macmillan Company. $2.25.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

itarian religion—the idea which Auguste Comte embodied in the first systematic statement of a science of society. Since the days of Comte there have been many attempts to interpret social achievement in terms exclusively of biological, anthropological, economic or political realities, but they have none of them worn very well. Most of them sought to crown with the authority of science some plan either to perpetuate or to extinguish the existing privileges and success of a class or a nation. It is refreshing, consequently, to find a prominent American sociologist with the approval of several of his colleagues proposing to restore religion to the function in society which it was supposed to occupy before the days of democracy, liberalism and socialism and to associate it with an ethical, semi-socialist scientific humanitarianism. Comte dubbed his religion of humanity catholic. It was, as Huxley said, Catholicism minus Christianity. Mr. Ellwood considers the religion of humanity which is to save modern civilization essentially Christian, but it is Christianity plus natural science.

But important as is Mr. Ellwood's plea for the restoration of religion and specifically of Christianity to a position of genuine influence over the conduct and thinking of modern democratic peoples, he does not allow sufficiently for the stubborn and in part the insurmountable difficulties which prevent the world and the ways of its denizens from becoming one hundred percent Christian. Since Jesus first planted the seed of Christianity in the soil of human consciousness, the converts to Christianity of all epochs and countries have planned, aspired, sacrificed, sweated and labored chiefly for the purpose of embodying what they took to be Christian truth in their own and other people's lives. The history of the Christian Church is the history of the good and bad fortune of this endeavor. The lesson of their experience is not entirely discouraging, but it scarcely justifies Mr. Ellwood's optimism about the complete practicability of Christianity as a moral code. Christ, it seems absurd but none the less pertinent to observe, died upon the Cross. None of the Christian saints, neither Bernard of Clairvaux nor Francis of Assisi nor George Fox, succeeded in redeeming their own and other people's lives as the result of the conviction and the personal demonstration of Christian truth in anything like, from their point of view, a satisfactory manner. The drama of the typically Christian soul begins with a sense of sin and ends with a sense of failure. The atonement which faith in Jesus promises to erring but aspiring human beings is not actual but vicarious. It is an imaginative and a symbolic rather than a literal consummation.

Modern science, as soon as its achievements and methods are intelligently and honestly applied to the amelioration of human life in this world, will no doubt remove many existing obstacles to human fulfillment. Aspiring and enlightened human beings will to an increasing extent and probably with increasing success spend their energy in removing these obstacles and will find a large part of their own fulfillment in this kind of service. But all this is a matter of social engineering rather than religion. No matter how successful such good works may be, they are only a preparation, a necessary preparation to be sure, for the consummate life. Religion itself as a matter of living has been and will be something different. It will consist of a passion for human regeneration which the faithful will always need to test in experience but which experience can never entirely vindicate, and which is expressed in spiritual exercises in prayer, in worship and in intensity and continuity of vision. The faithful Christian, no matter how valuable the assistance his aspiration may derive from modern science, must still seek his own salvation and that of other people partly in a vicarious atonement. Religious aspiration obtains a vindication in the imagination which it cannot obtain from the testimony of actual facts. This vindication will derive part of its reality even in the imagination from the discipline of intelligent experiments in adjustment to actual conditions. Yet it must seek self-reconciliation and peace finally through the symbolic composition of faith with understanding rather than through the partial and casual realization of its aspirations in an actual Kingdom of God on earth.

As I see it, the hope which modern science brings to the religious life is not the hope of a successful practical career for Christianity. Necessary as it is to labor in good faith for the progressive establishment of the Kingdom of God in this world, the attempt will fail almost in the same measure that it succeeds. Good Christians will achieve their success through conflict—through conflict often overcome but always renewed; and this conflict will be the outward reflection of a permanent discrepancy between the accidents of the origin and make-up of human nature and the unity and peace of ultimate understanding which religious aspiration seeks. Yet the imagination can reign over this conflict even though conduct cannot, and it is essential to the art of consummate living that the imagination should have a free chance. For the peace, the understanding and the goodwill to men which may possess the vision of the partners in a religious fellowship are not quietist. They are creative and are certain to overflow in good works, whenever science supplies them with the understanding of actual conditions. It is by these symbolic victories that the individual spirit achieves the energy, the elasticity, the persistence and the hospitality of consciousness which is characteristic of the religious spirit.

The promise which the advance in science has brought to the religious life is the promise of a more sustained and illuminating flight for the religious imagination. It will help man to win peace through understanding. The attainment of the living synthesis between life and truth which we call religion depends not only upon the energy of the original impulse and the sharing it with others but upon the fullness of the understanding of human nature upon which the aspiration can feed. Jesus presented to the world a singularly deep understanding of human nature, but deep as it was, it is capable of being indefinitely supplemented and enriched. It is now being supplemented and enriched as never before in the history of knowledge; and this enrichment will eventually permit the emancipation of many more individual spirits and their flight towards religious expression. The greater the knowledge men and women achieve about themselves, the more they will crave the illumination and transfiguration of religious faith. There are only a few facts within us or without us which we can at any one moment control and change for the better, but we can always understand, and for the most part we can only understand. The kind of understanding of ourselves and other human beings which is purged of illusion and self-interest, which is prompted by love and sustained by faith is creative in relation both to individual and social fulfillment.

Mr. Ellwood's identification of Christianity with social service asks at once too much and too little of Christianity. He declares that a Christian world is practicable and that all other worlds are impracticable. Yet the world has never been more than nominally Christian and somehow it has up to date made a show of working. It will continue to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

work with more or less waste. He over-emphasizes the extent to which a genuinely Christian "mores" had penetrated the lives of our forebears. He under-emphasizes the actual difficulties of imposing anything like Christian ethics on the world of today. He assumes that the published derivation of the ideal of social service from religious truth and the published supremacy of the Church over the State will tend to create their own objects; but he does not tell us how. It is admitted that neither religious truth nor ecclesiastical proclamations exercise anything like the authority over human conduct which on Mr. Ellwood's theory they ought to exercise. Are they going to obtain this influence merely as the result of claiming it and of supporting the claim by exhortation and propaganda? Will the clergy succeed in getting themselves accepted as social engineers merely by displaying the sign in the vestibule of their churches? Before they can expect any such vindication they will have to learn and practice much more than they now know about the art of individual and associated life.

The propaganda which Christianity needs and for which true Christians are now hungering are lessons in self and other regeneration through candid and disinterested understanding. In spite of Mr. Ellwood's wish to see religious aspiration discharged in social behavior, something essential in the nature of religion as life escapes him. He betrays this default by calling his book the Reconstruction of Religion. It is a dubious phrase. Reformers can reconstruct ecclesiastical institutions, sectarian creeds and religious ideas, but to demand the reconstruction of religion is equivalent to demanding the reconstruction of poetry. Religion takes flight in novel and beautiful instances of consummate living. Reconstruction of one kind or another can at best remove some of the obstacles to a new birth of the religious life. While we can order many improvements in social practice and institutions, we cannot order a St. Francis of Assisi any more than we can order a Shakespeare. Yet without certain modern analogies of St. Bernard or St. Francis to reawaken the imagination of popular Christianity, the Christian Church will never by the successful practice of social engineering create and educate the kind of Christians who are capable of recovering a living synthesis between life and truth.

HERBERT CROLY.

Ontario Hydro-Electric

THE policy of state regulation of municipal utilities has become as generally established as is national regulation of the railroads. Both systems are kept under the constant and sometimes constructive fire of the advocates of complete public ownership and control. The struggle in the municipal field—held somewhat in abeyance during the war—is undoubtedly being resumed. Detroit has recently purchased her street railways and Los Angeles her power plant and its distribution system. In November the voters in California will act on the Water and Power act designed to further cooperation between municipalities in water power development. Next month the same proposition comes before the Georgia legislature.

Some interest therefore attaches to a report recently issued by the National Electric Light Association on the organization and operation of the Ontario (Canada) Hydro-Electric Commission. The pamphlet of two hundred and forty-four pages, sumptuously printed in at least four colors, is entitled Government owned and Controlled Compared with Privately Owned and Regulated Electric Utilities in Canada and the U. S. The author of the report is William S. Murray, who conceived the idea of a super-power survey of the Boston-Washington (D. C.) district and later obtained from Secretary Lane permission to conduct it under the auspices of the Department of the Interior.

The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario came into being with the passage in 1907 of the Power Commission act by the Provincial Legislature. It provides cooperative municipal ownership under independent commission control for the purpose of developing the water power resources of the Province of Ontario. There were at the time of the creation of the Commission and still are private electric companies operating in the province. In 1910 operations began with twelve municipalities supplied from one system with a load of less than 1000 H. P. and an investment of $3,750,000. At present there are three hundred and fifty cooperating municipalities supplied from fourteen different systems with a total capital expenditure of approximately $200,000,000. The load now supplied exceeds 350,000 H. P. Upon completion of construction now under way the Commission will control approximately 1,000,000 H. P. Under the terms of the act, current is supplied "at cost," and participation is left to the vote of the electorate of each municipality. Sir Adam Beack, a citizen of London, Ontario, and by vocation a box-maker is given principal credit for the inception and execution of the plan. He acts as chairman of the Commission.

In the consideration of this report the auspices under which it is issued appear significant. The object of the N. E. L. A. *as stated in the Constitution* is

> to advance the art and science of production, distribution and use of electrical energy for light, heat and power for public service. In the furtherance of this object its activities shall be largely educational and for the fullest development of the electrical engineering arts and sciences in all their branches. It shall not be engaged in business.

To one unfamiliar with N. E. L. A. vernacular this describes a bona fide technical-scientific organization as contrasted with one having at least one eye—possibly both—on business and profits. But a study of the membership provisions may arouse some suspicions. Class A or Central Station *Company* members and Class D or Manufacturer *Company* members are the only ones entitled "to attend all meetings of the Association, to vote and to hold office." Through the grouping of the large majority of central stations in holding companies and otherwise the number of individuals who thus share in policy determinations and in electing officers is very limited—probably less than one hundred. The large "membership"—over 11,000—consists of various *non-voting* groups such as (1) Class B

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who are "elected or continued from year to year with the written approval of the Class A (central station company) members with which they are connected"; (2) Class C—mostly college professors—who "may become or remain members only upon the invitation and approval of the National Executive Committee"; Class E, who are employees of Class D (manufacturing company) members; and Class F—jobbers, dealers, contractors, electrical or mechanical engineers, publishers, etc. Thus it will be seen that the effort has been made to have everyone connected with the electrical industry from the educators to the retailers of supplies coordinated under the N. E. L. A. banner. All the power, however, resides in a handful of manufacturers and central station operators who meet in executive session. Many vital decisions appear to be made for the N. E. L. A. by inner groups such as the Electric Bond and Share (a General Electric promoting organization) and the Association of Edison Illuminating Companies—a grouping principally of the large Metropolitan central stations.

Financial support for the N. E. L. A. is provided largely through a percentage levy on the gross income of the larger companies and so absorbed in rates. The only dues for members other than company members is a $3.00 fee which is the subscription price to the Bulletin, one of the publications through which N. E. L. A. policies are broadcasted.

The 1916 draft of the N. E. L. A. Constitution was preceded by a lengthy prospectus, a few sentences from which constitute perhaps a more direct statement of its objectives:

> This Association is organized to foster and protect central station interests without regard to the source from which the dangers that threaten such interests may come. . . . To hold and completely to occupy the territory within the practicable working area surrounding it is the right and duty of every central station company. . . . Infringements upon such territory do not necessarily require the presence of a competitor within it. The policy of one state and of the towns within it, in legislating on subjects pertaining to central station interests will affect, favorably or unfavorably, similar interests throughout the country. This clearly shows that a company's business may be impaired and possibly destroyed by the influence of things done beyond the limits of its own town and state. . . . An investor's interest is the same in all undertakings, all countries and all languages; it is security and profit.

From the N. E. L. A. standpoint the competition of a successful public plant in Canada would be as real a menace to a central station operator as if it were in the next county.

Mr. Murray's report is a splendid example of N. E. L. A. vernacular. Like all their vernacular it consists almost exclusively of discussions, diagrams, tables and comparisons having little or no relevancy. What boots it if the annual cost of street lighting per capita is less in Montreal than in Toronto when with a considerably smaller population than Montreal it is shown that Toronto has not only a greater mileage of streets and side-walks but ten times as many street lights? Why is it of any interest that electric street lighting costs per capita sixty-seven cents in Toronto and sixty cents in Buffalo when it is also true that about half the Buffalo street lighting is by gas or gasoline while in Toronto all street lights are electric?

Again in making per capita comparisons as to the use of electricity by the rural populations in Ontario and California Mr. Murray ignores the fact that the situations are not comparable owing to the large use of power in California for irrigation purposes while such use for current is practically unknown in Ontario.

Far more serious, however, are what appear to be the all too frequent misstatements as to facts. For instance Mr. Murray charges that the Commission has evaded the law in not setting up a sinking fund to retire the outstanding bond issues of the Ontario Power Company. Sir Adam in a printed reply lists the items which justified setting aside $382,270 for this purpose in 1921. Mr. Murray alleges that the Commission has unlimited power under the creating act which he quotes. Sir Adam points out that in quoting the act Mr. Murray omitted six pregnant words, "By the next preceding three sections," which appear to invalidate completely the charge. Again, Mr. Murray says "No suit could have been brought since the Commission cannot be sued without a fiat from the Attorney-General and to date no fiat has been granted." Sir Adam replies that to date tweny-nine such fiats have been granted.

"Costs" in the vernacular of the utility world mean many different things. Cost-accounting as it is practiced in the industrial world is practically unknown in the electric utility field. As in the case of the steam railroads the art has not been developed to the point of obtaining reasonably accurate costs for units of service. Thus the recommended practice of the N. E. L. A. is restricted to a tabulation of functional costs such as generation, transmission, utilization, etc. This lack of real cost accounting forces the industry to oppose—as does Mr. Murray—rates based on service at cost in which the word "cost" is given only the significance it has in the manufacturing world generally.

The use of functional and other bulk "costs," quoting rates which will "get the business" and the opportunity afforded for having small consumers carry more than their fair share of the expense, have led to building up an illogical rate structure, the support of which at times becomes the main consideration. At the present moment the whole industry stands well nigh impotent before power-factor losses simply because no one can foresee what effect their correction will have on revenues derived through a system of rates based largely on expediency. So we can refuse to accept as final Mr. Murray's dicta as to costs. We can be sympathetic with all his apprehensions as to the ultimate failure of Hydro-electric and still recall that he is only the latest of a long line of eminent critics. Both the principles on which rates are determined and the annual adjustment of costs are subject to the approval of auditors appointed by the Provincial authorities.

From a consumer's standpoint, of course, actual bills resulting from *rates* are the best measure of the cost of service. In the "Summary of Conclusions" Mr. Murray states that "the supply (in the United States) is cheaper to the consumer" and "power (in the United States) is being furnished at less cost." Notwithstanding the importance of such facts if true Mr. Murray gives no supporting data.

On the contrary it appears that rates in Ontario are rarely more than half what they are in many American cities. In certain instances rates in American territory contiguous to Ontario are several times as large as Hydro-Electric rates. For instance compare rates in Toronto with those in Detroit—where Alex Dow, chairman of the N. E. L. A. "Research" Committee, is head of the private company. Here we use actual Toronto bills and figure out the corresponding Detroit charge by means of their published tariff:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FOR DOMESTIC LIGHTING AND COOKING

FLOOR AREA	ROOMS CHD. FOR	YEARLY K. W. HRS.	TORONTO YEARLY BILL	DETROIT YEARLY BILL
1000	3	2313	$27.30	$92.99
1600	4	5365	58.65	206.10
3000	5	3005	45.97	124.38

FOR POWER SERVICE (SMALL LOADS)

CONNECTED LOAD	HRS. PER YEAR	YEARLY KWH	TORONTO YEARLY BILL	DETROIT YEARLY BILL
5 H. P.	345	1162	$88.77	$313.43
6.5	975	4750	139.11	339.01
5	950	3573	103.03	259.24

FOR COMMERCIAL LIGHTING

INSTALLED CAPACITY K. W.	YEARLY KWH.	TORONTO YEARLY BILL	DETROIT YEARLY BILL
5	2711	$105.16	$203.00
6.4	5470	192.66	349.83
6	23873	357.60	936.17

In every instance Ontario public rates include an item covering a thirty year amortization reserve to retire the securities issued to raise the money used to develop the plant. With a proper depreciation fund the property will thus be owned free and clear by the people at the end of thirty years.

In Mr. Murray's efforts toward "thoroughness" he slipped up in a chart showing that for the years 1916-20 the privately owned properties in Quebec adopted a policy of no new construction because of high prices incident to the war while in Ontario the Commission went ahead with the Queenstown-Chippewa project. This of course will be accepted by most readers as an example of laudable initiative on the part of a publicly operated utility. Mr. Murray is reminded that in practically every instance where private utility companies in the United States undertook war time construction at the then prevailing prices any excess cost was assumed by the government under the head of "war wastage." Thus I have before me one contract negotiated between Uncle Sam and an electric company providing for a $20,000,000 addition to the latter's plant. The electric company agreed to pay for the plant two years after the war at its then value. In some contracts these valuations were to be made three or four years after the close of the war as determined by the President's proclamation. The contributions which our government was thus forced to make to the private utility companies is a considerable element in the present high federal tax rate. In Ontario any excess cost due to the war is being met through the rates for current. No part of this cost is a burden on the tax payer. This is part of a general policy. All expenses of whatever nature are included in the charge for service. "There has never been a single cent collected in the taxes of any municipality to be used in connection with the operation of any hydro-electric utility."

Curiously enough all privately owned utility companies—even those which conservatively refrained from new construction during the war—are profiting by the event. The private companies generally throughout the United States now insist, and have insisted, that they should have a return upon reproduction cost new at current prices regardless of when the plant was installed. Consequently they have not only asked for a return upon the investment actually made but a return upon the increased theoretical reproduction cost of their entire property due solely to war and post-war conditions. Under this system T. E. Mitten is able to claim a value of $290,000,000 for the Philadelphia Rapid Transit property when the city authorities using the "prudent investment" less depreciation variously estimate fair value at a figure between $90,000,000 and $120,000,000.

In the matter of publicity the contrast between the conditions Mr. Murray encountered in Ontario and the usual practice in the United States is marked. Mr. Murray asked Sir Adam some sixty questions in writing and received "painstaking replies" to each, also in writing. It was apparent that Sir Adam and his associates "wanted the facts made known." There was a disposition "to respond to every request for full information and many times on subjects that could be interpreted as almost personal." In this country especially when the cities are trying to secure rate reductions or to ascertain the facts on which to act, the electric utility companies usually obstruct, delay, refuse to open their books or assist. The Bell telephone companies are often marked exceptions to this rule.

The report assumes that, as a policy, state regulation in the United States has already justified itself. Regulation has undoubtedly become more satisfactory—especially to the private companies—as a substitute for the chaos which preceded it. But no one—except possibly a representative of the N. E. L. A.—can ignore the delays and administrative incompetence shown in many rate cases. Until regulation works more smoothly and promptly and with a higher regard for public as well as for private interest an outstanding example of an effectively operated public service like the Ontario Hydro-Electric must command our attention.

MORRIS LLEWELLYN COOKE.

"The Time When I Was Plowing"

The time when I was plowing
The fields and days were long,
The weeds went back forever
And the morning-glory clung;
Behind the rumps of horses
The sod ran off forever,
With earth the share was bright;
The sod ran off forever,
The days ran into night.

The time when I was seeding
With rain in the wind
The fields and days were endless
Under the sky's end;
Here with the disks' turning
And with the horses' treading
A white day was unending,
And time was out of mind.

The times when I was binding
The fields and hours were wide;
Clear to the utter sunset
My sheaves lay side by side;
And life was long as seeming
In a dusk falling,
And in the road the dust was brown
With wagons going up to town.

The time I drove my wagon
Beside a tradesman's door
I dropped the reins and left it
Nor reaped or seeded more,
And years are counted pennies
Dwindling to a score.

MAXWELL ANDERSON.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A COMMUNICATION

To the Honorable Charles E. Hughes

SIR: The whole world is coming to realize your ability in promoting efficiency in our diplomatic relations with the countries represented at the Limitation of Armaments Conference in Washington. Your remarkable success in this respect leads me to call to your attention a few examples of the deplorable inefficiency of our foreign service, and particularly our diplomatic service, in the hope that you may find time, before the end of the summer, to turn your thoughts to bettering the machinery for establishing contacts with other nations abroad—i. e., our diplomatic agencies.

I am sure, Sir, that some of the facts which I am offering (which are based either on my own experience or on the testimony of other diplomatic secretaries) have never reached you. I am equally convinced that when the Administration, the Congress, and the American public become aware of the ridiculous light in which our great country is presented to the world through our inefficient representatives and inadequate equipment, a spontaneous movement will make itself felt toward bettering our diplomatic service. Why should the tax-payers support a moribund institution which not only fails too often to help the American citizen in foreign parts, but makes the whole nation a laughing stock? The worst failures are in the smaller countries where the light of American publicity shines but dimly, although the post may be most important internationally. Congress is chiefly to blame, because from year to year it neglects to vote for adequate appropriations for the Department of State. Our diplomatic service should be remodeled into a "going concern" or else close its doors, as a bank does when it fails.

While I am conscious that my experience in the service is limited (I was under orders slightly less than four years, including two and a half years at the Embassy in Paris during the war, and a year in Mexico) I feel that, having been stationed at two of our best foreign missions as well as at two of our most dilapidated, I have had exceptional opportunities for comparison and detailed investigation. If my opportunities of observation were unusual, my freedom to make friendly suggestions is equally so. Few diplomatic officers still in the service dare criticize it, even verbally.

I have nothing to gain personally from making this exposé, but I hope that it may result in a great good—the thorough making over of the diplomatic service.

I invite your attention to the following facts:

1. During the summer of 1921, the Department of State had done away with the regular mail-pouch service, for official mail, in the whole region of the Balkans, if not in all Europe. There was no official mail-pouch between the Embassy at Paris and the Legation at Bucharest, Rumania, where I was serving as Secretary. Confidential official letters, therefore, had to be sent by open mail to and from the legation, *and were regularly opened and inspected by thieves.* I am informed that the American Minister at Bucharest called this breakdown in the mail service to the attention of the State Department, without result.

2. There being no pouch service to the Legation at Bucharest, the representatives of the government there (supposedly its "eyes and ears") were nearly as ignorant of happenings in every quarter of the globe, including the United States, as if they had been in Central Tibet. Our chief source of world news was the Paris edition of the New York Herald, which arrived from France irregularly, and several days late. Although the department's "Instructions to the Diplomatic Officers of the United States" (which has not been revised since President Cleveland's Administration—1897) provides for the sending of newspapers to foreign missions, the State Department in 1921 had ceased complying with these regulations.

3. The only confidential means of communication between the Legation and the State Department was the cable. The allowance for official cablegrams had been cut to $166 a month, for the fiscal year ending June, 1922. Cables to the United States from Rumania cost in August, 1921, thirty lei a word, equivalent to forty-two cents at that time. Thus the monthly appropriations for cablegrams,—that is for all confidential messages—with Washington, "Permitted Sending" four hundred words, or about one-third of a newspaper column. Any official cables passing this limit had to be paid for each month from the American Minister's pocket.

We read in the press that the department has set aside $1,171,982.64 as "estimated savings" for the fiscal year ending June, 1922. We believe, however, that our government would have done well to listen to the advice of former Secretary of State Colby, who called attention, in 1920-1921, to the positive loss in efficiency which would result from the cutting of funds for departmental cable communications.

4. The letter files at the Legation at Bucharest, though greatly improved during 1921, were still in an extremely unbusiness-like condition (through no fault of the present staff) last summer. Chiefly to blame for this is the State Department filing system in use at the Legation, which is antiquated and decidedly inferior to the decimal system employed by the War Department, "Described in" the "War Department Correspondence File—Revised Edition, 1918."

5. Congress steadily refuses, moreover, to vote enough money to enable the State Department to own its offices and official residences abroad, as all other nations do. The result in Bucharest has been that the only building rentable as home and office for the present American minister was so uncomfortable and in such a state of disrepair that no one has cared to live in it recently. As a result of the disorganization in the legation building, the present American Minister was last August facing the prospect of paying the following items personally, as no provision was made for them from the official funds: doorman for the Legation; private stenographer, to supplement the work of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the official staff; five hundred dollars towards the annual rental of the Legation, not covered by the official stipend; two hundred and eighty dollars (twenty thousand lei) to repair heating apparatus, etc., in order to render the Legation barely habitable for the Minister's wife and children; Legation automobile and running expenses; wages of Legation chauffeur; water-tank on Legation roof, and new plumbing, to be added in order to obtain running water inside; new furniture for servants' quarters.

The honor of representing the United States abroad is indeed dearly bought at the present time.

6. The Legation at Bucharest, having waited in one case ten months, and in the other longer for the arrival of two typewriters requested from the Department of State, was last August obliged to borrow two machines from the local representative of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, these being delivered at the Legation the day on which my voluntary resignation from the service took effect.

7. The fund appropriated by Congress, to enable the United States government to buy its own embassy in so important a capital as Paris, is entirely inadequate for the purpose. "Twice as much as we have *might do,*" said one of the older secretaries at Paris last summer.

Most of the evils mentioned above are due to insufficient funds, for which the lack of interest displayed by Congress, and the apathy of the American people behind Congress, are chiefly responsible. But how can the public be expected to call for a reform when it has no inkling of the abuses to which the diplomatic service has sunk?

A second series of evils, those attaching to the quality of the diplomatic service personnel, may also be attributed to inadequate appropriations and insufficient salaries.

The salaries are at present so low that only secretaries and chiefs of mission with private means, irrespective of their ability as men, can accept diplomatic appointments. A more undemocratic arrangement, or one better calculated to assist the survival of the unfit, can hardly be imagined. As a consequence of these conditions, the State Department is run like a mediaeval court. Kissing goes by favor, almost always to the well to do, occasionally to the well fitted.

There are strange rumors—and I give one merely as such—that tend to illustrate the depths of inadequacy to which our representatives may sink. Many secretaries now in the service will know the story of an American Minister who served for years under both Republican and Democratic administrations, and developed an extraordinary reputation, as a result of which many men wanted to hit him—and some did—and all good looking women avoided him like a plague. I do not know whether this individual is still (January, 1922) misrepresenting the United States. I do know that a full account of his more notorious escapades, in writing, was given in 1918, or 1919 to an Assistant Secretary of State, who apparently failed to take action to have this Minister immediately recalled. For years, it is said, this detested person degraded the name of the United States, without receiving, so far as I can discover, so much as a rebuke from authorities in Washington.

Examples of this sort of hard-boiled "diplomat" could be multiplied, but space does not permit.

It is difficult to determine whether this type of representative, or others having more agreeable qualities, but limited mentality, may do more harm to our country abroad. Both types could be eliminated from the State Department personnel by the adoption of the following changes:

Pay higher salaries to both diplomatic secretaries and chiefs of mission. Establish compulsory preparatory training of at least one year, prior to an entrance examination of the severest sort, to be required before diplomatic secretaries are appointed by the President (that the present examinations are a farce is proved by the fact that but three weeks' preparation suffices in order to pass with flying colors). Promote the ablest secretaries to be Ministers and Ambassadors. *Establish consultative examinations for each secretary on his return from each foreign post.*

The difficulty of paying higher salaries may seem great, but it is of fundamental importance. We read that the government plans to spend the money saved by not building certain battleships in reclaiming swamp lands. It appears to many of us more important to drain the muddy water out of the diplomatic service. Diplomatists are the government's agencies for preserving peace. They should be properly supported unless a substitute for them is set up. Present salaries are too low. A married secretary's remuneration in Bucharest today is about $2,800 per annum. A recent estimate for the lowest living wage in New York City for a day laborer's family is $2,600. Even considering the apparent advantage from the exchange in converting dollars into Rumanian lei, these figures are far too close together.

A modern ship of war of the largest type costs $40,000,000. The same sum devoted to preventing war, through the establishment of a competent diplomatic service, would double the salary of every secretary on the pay-roll for one hundred years, and leave a substantial surplus. What could be more fitting than that the diplomatic service, supposedly the government's organ to assist in insuring peace, should profit by the decisions of the Conference for the Limitation of Armaments? Only by paying larger salaries and insisting on adequate training can we take the service out of the hands of amateurs, and make it attractive to men whom we can be proud to claim as our representatives. There is no dearth of able young Americans who are anxious to serve their country in this way. They simply lack the means.

In the future, let us hope, we shall not hear from American army, navy and business men, as I heard from a United States military attaché the other day, "I have served at seven legations and embassies in Europe, and I have never yet met an American diplomatic secretary who could have graduated from West Point." Of course, there are diplomatic officers and missions which are brilliant exceptions to the general rule. The Embassy in Paris during the war, and the Embassy in Mexico under the Honorable Henry P. Fletcher, are cases in point. There is no reason why this arm of the administration should not, if properly encouraged, rival the best of similar services in Europe; but in too many parts of the world at present, the following statement of a clerk of legation, written last summer, holds true.

"Before coming here I considered an American legation a business organization existing for the purpose of furthering the interests of the American government and its citi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

zens in the country where it is located. I have found it to be an institution hide-bound by regulations and red tape, which hinder the execution of the smallest service which an American citizen has a right to expect and demand. Its entire motto seems to be, 'We will serve you if we cannot find a regulation which forbids it.' "

In short, with its unprotected mails, its almost non-existent cable service, its filing system musty with age, its inadequate and decaying buildings, its aged equipment and miserly funds, and above all, its unrepresentative and mediocre personnel, the diplomatic service is anything but a going concern. We feel that if it is not materially and immediately improved, it might as well be eliminated, in whole or in part. As has been well said, and as this Administration obviously realizes, as a nation "we are provincials no longer." We must begin to deal with foreign governments on an equal footing. The time has come for action. I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,
HENRY R. CAREY,
Formerly Secretary
New York City. United States Diplomatic Service.

Again the Chauve Souris

MR. BALIEFF, Director of the Chauve Souris Theatre of Moscow, and Mr. Morris Gest, producer of the enterprise in America, are astute, one would say, as well as artistic. Both have realized and subtly advertised the caviar quality of their offering. Uniqueness has now been enhanced by transferring the show (and this is what the thing is—a show just as a circus, a miracle play and all essential drama is show) from an ordinary playhouse to a more recondite setting on top of the Century Theatre. The roof auditorium has been re-decorated by Mr. Remisoff, scenic artist of the Bat Theatre, in the riot of hues characteristic of Russian art and of a steppe-ridden people nostalgic for movement and color. In the frescoed fairy-tale, princes rise on magic carpets over impossible mosques and towers, the note of fantastic exaggeration which is the charm of the Chauve Souris is struck, and one sits there enclosed in an alien kaleidoscope. Outside, in the lobby, arched windows present glimpses of a blue, gold-pricked night city which seems part of Mr. Balieff's little game, rather than familiar stone and asphalt.

Mr. Balieff, the calm conjuror, his pale clown's face imparting to us a dispassionate consciousness that most of the world is best taken as foolery and none of us so grandly important after all, pulls out from his hat a new series of surprises. This second bill is well up to the first one. From the first have been carried over The Wooden Soldiers and Katinka, both permanently enchanting. In The Wooden Soldiers there is rhythm and consummate mimicry; in Katinka droll joie de vivre enough to set us up for a year.

Vitality is really the great stock in trade of these Russian artists—vitality and a happy abandon which Anglo-Saxons would be apt to suspect and would certainly never approximate. In their instinct for play these actors are of course arch-artists. It is because they are really amusing themselves that they are able so vividly to grimace, so gracefully to dance, so whole heartedly to sing. And yet back of this freedom there is in all of them a critical aesthetic mind, a natural taste, ever watchful of effect, emphasizing a note here, exercising restraint there.

Mr. Balieff's method is consistently suggestion. He takes, for instance, an old French ballad like The King's Drums are Beating and stages the story of it; this is a slight thread to hang a scene on, one would think. But the legend becomes poignant drama through a beautiful use of light, through significant grouping and economical but portentous gesture; what is more, the spirit of the folk-song is conserved so that we have a tragedy of criminal love and death saturated with the naïve pomp dear to the popular and child-like imagination. There is almost always a touch of sophisticated humor in the Chauve Souris' approach of any subject, a gentle smiling at the human puppets,—Love we may, sing, weep, hope, dance, and even hate and kill. But still we are puppets, infinitely small against a gigantic back-drop, one moment gilded in the impersonal blaze of the foot-lights, tomorrow thrown quaintly sprawling into the roomy darkness of the wings.

Giant fate versus pigmy man—Aeschylus and Sophocles discovered this combat to be the authentic subject of drama; to emphasize the generality of the conflict the tragic actors masked themselves apart from personal attention. Gordon Craig, pursuing the same idea, preaches the return to the puppet—conventionalized man, a symbol moving in the pageant of life and death. The Chauve Souris approximates Craig's ideal; its actors are painted away from themselves into bright or lurid dolls. Of egomania there is no trace among these artists; they are willing to sublimate themselves into playthings. They are brilliant dramatic masks lifting us gratefully aloof from the marcel wave of Miss Elsie Ferguson, or Miss Billie Burke's favorite color. The puppet idea is carried out very literally in various numbers where we see actual dolls—wooden soldiers, jerkily moving figures on a music-box, Dutch boys and girls that slide off a blue Delft plate to go through a little pantomime of awkward love-making and jealousy. Manikins they are, rather than men; through them we are dragged down to healthy earth as by the laughter of Rabelais or Molière, and our souls are purged by a sense of insignificance. Always, except in the glimpses of Russian life such as the drinking song of the Black Hussars (a tableau of admirable emotional lighting) the protagonists of the series of playlets are abstractions.

There are several notable features in this second show. One, a peasants' dance—seven jolly kerchiefed women and an impossibly swaggering soldier stamping and waving arms in an always graceful and controlled delirium. Another, a weird song chanted by curious hooded black forms outlined in Daumier massivety against a bright doorway. Part of Mr. Balieff's genius is that we never know who or what these figures are, nor, odder still, do we want to know; mystery, the strangeness which is part of beauty is a too neglected portion of the dramatic as well as of every other kind of art.

The gem of the evening is called The Clown, a creation which seems the top-notch of the Chauve Souris' achievement in this country. Absent from it is the sketchiness, the slight thinness of subject matter or setting that is apparent in some of the Russian improvizations. Improvization is the mainspring of art, but in the Chauve Souris one has occasionally been aware of a slap-dash adaptation of means to ends a little reminiscent of those clever charades the So-and-So's organized over the week-end.

The Clown is a triumphant justification of the compressed drama of rapid evocation. The curtain goes up to a mournful and passionate Chopin mazurka, disclosing a dark velvet scene, set on each side with the bizarre

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hoops and barrels that constitute a clown's paraphernalia. Then the curtain parts at the back, revealing for an instant a glare hinting at the arena's turmoil; a figure steals in, closing out that world beyond. Left to himself, the clown, for it is he, unmistakable in his red wig porcupining out in wild points and his striped pantaloons, strikes a strange attitude of anguish. Then he gyrates and tumbles gracefully about, but his skilled rhythmic movements are forgotten in the amazing spiritual drama he presents. A great mime, Mr. Kotchetovsky, who impersonates for us The Clown! Such despair one has seldom seen represented by gesture, such yearning for something irrevocably lost, such sudden, mad tumbling as if to forget grief—the grief of a rejected lover, of a starved worshipper of beauty, of a lonely performer for roaring and complacent multitudes. Mr. Kotchetovsky told us without words that The Clown is the artist, he who feels more than others, and who, by some mandate of nature, of his physical and psychical constitution, is yet unhappy unless he reveals to the whole world his unhappiness. He is the exhibitionist. Sane men will laugh at him, proud men despise him. His arm is over his eyes, warding off derisive blows; and yet, outraged and ridiculed, he must and will to the high tiers of strangers perpetually give his last secret away.

The opening night audience at the Chauve Souris, although enthusiastic over much else, greeted The Clown with coldness. Possibly The Clown was a performance for clowns only; but the disciples of normalcy should at least have appreciated the setting's suggestive beauty and the delicate and vibrant art of the dancer who graced this number.

The Chauve Souris deals in over-tones, in evocation, in short-cuts. Realizing art to be intensity, it stands or falls by a series of swift, unexpected impressions. Although capable of the graceful, the finished, the elegiac, it is not afraid of the grotesque, the violent or the naïve; for the most part gay and ridiculous, it will not take anything, even itself, too seriously; its actors are as selfless as children joining hands in a dance; and one watches such perfect play, such imaginative rightness with a pleased gratitude.

MARY CASS CANFIELD.

CORRESPONDENCE

A Retrial for Sacco and Vanzetti

SIR: Many persons who followed the trial of Sacco and Vanzetti last summer were convinced that the verdict was a grave miscarriage of justice. New evidence has since then been unearthed which will presumably reopen the case and which the defense confidently expects will completely vindicate the accused.

But to run down this new evidence has been immensely laborious,—and expensive. Recently, when what proved a most fruitful lead had opened, the defense was without funds to follow it. A few hundred dollars were advanced by persons who had already been heavy contributors,—and presently the defense was again at a standstill, with essential evidence in sight. A few hundred dollars more from the same faithful friends, allowed further links in the chain to be forged. Thus has the defense been forced to live from hand to mouth—with the lives of two men at stake.

The case will very shortly be ready to be reported. But court proceedings are costly and the defense treasury is all but empty once more.

In every continent, class conscious proletariats, and lovers of justice outside of the working class, are watching this case. Indeed, it is the United States that is on trial,—not two humble Italians. Shall it be said that in this land, once proudly called "The land of the free," justice failed for lack of money?

The undersigned will be glad to receive contributions from those to whom the good name of their country is precious beyond price.

ELIZABETH GLENDOWER EVANS.

7 Wellington Terrace,
Brookline, Massachusetts.

Sedition?

SIR: On Thursday, September 23, 1920, Mr. Herbert Hoover, then of Stanford University, California, appeared before the Special Committee on Reconstruction and Production in the conference room of the Engineering Societies Building in New York City. At the conclusion of the hearing, Senator Calder thanked Mr. Hoover for coming and asked him to communicate suggestions as to the kind of investigation the committee might undertake. There was one suggestion which Mr. Hoover was able to make immediately. He said, "I should think that if your powers of inquiry are wide enough, it would be well to extend your inquiry to the question of the reconstruction of the departments in the federal government. That is one of the most immediate problems. *We have the most antiquated organization and administration in government that we have in any kind of activity in the United States, and that is not a credit to our skill and intelligence.*" Said Senator Calder, *"I have been in Washington sixteen years, and I quite agree with you."*

I could not help thinking that were the Secretary of State and Senator from New York candidates for a teaching position in New York State, their eligibility would be regarded with more than suspicion.

HENRY HARAP.

New York City.

The Miners Need Help

SIR: The conditions in the New River Coal Field of West Virginia remain about the same as they were a month ago, evictions and hunger (some of the miners' families being forced to eat the herbs on the hillside) are the continuous order of the day but the spirit of fine determination to maintain the cause of unionization is strong within the miners and their families. As one of them wrote me in a personal letter:

> "We do not ask for anything but a living wage for our wives and children, so that they can look half decent. But they [the operators] want us not to have anything but cornbread and beans. So we will stay out until Gabriel toots his horn if we can get something to eat. They have the jails of West Virginia full of men just because they belong to our union. They will have to build their jails bigger for we will not give up our organization."

The readers of the New Republic who have helped the miner to keep body and soul together and who have doubtless followed with interest the accounts in the daily press of the meetings held in New York during May, in which a committee of the miners' families took an active part, will be interested to know that over $8,000 was raised by that campaign and that union labor is putting its shoulder to the wheel. This however does not mean that the miners are fed—quite the contrary—they are still hungry and therefore both they and the unions are in danger. Will not all believers in the American spirit of independence send a contribution at once? Remember that all donations go for food, no deduction even for postage, and now is the time to act.

ELISABETH GILMAN, Treasurer,
West Virginia Miners
Relief Committee.

513 Park Avenue,
Baltimore.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is Insanity a Ground for Divorce?

SIR: Several weeks ago a friend of mine came to me to speak about a woman who had been married for nearly thirty years to a man who for almost twenty-three years had been insane. My friend told me that the woman could not get a divorce, inasmuch as no law permitting divorce for insanity existed in Massachusetts. As I was brought up in a country where such a law prevailed, my surprise grew constantly as my friend proceeded to tell me about this Mrs. S. At present she is a woman of about fifty. She has had a hard struggle to bring up her five small children with the very limited amount she could herself earn; for a few years after their marriage her husband became unable to work on account of his mental condition. He was abusive and cruel, dangerous to the moral development of the children, and a constant source of terror to the family. For nearly thirteen years he was at home, subject to intermittent fits of melancholia and mania in which he tortured his wife and children. Finally he was removed by force and he became dangerous to such a degree that the physician in charge had him transferred to the Worcester State Asylum. There he has remained since, showing no improvement. Four of the children have married; one girl is still at home. Mrs. S. is working hard for her living. Her children are of no particular assistance; her health is not too good. For seven years she has known a man who wants to marry and take care of her; but she cannot marry him. There is no hope of cure or improvement for Mr. S.

Another case I know about is that of a young woman of twenty-seven, who married at seventeen. Her husband became insane after three years of marriage. There were three children then. Up to that time his occupation as chauffeur had given them a small but sufficient livelihood. One day seven years ago Mr. T. went away for a fortnight, returned and threatened to kill the children. After some time he was sent to the Worcester asylum, where he was kept for over a year. His condition improved, and in accordance with Mrs. T.'s desire he was released and came home again. After two days he again became violent. Mrs. T. urged the immediate removal of her husband and he was sent back to Worcester. Another child was born in normal time. After the lapse of two further years, T. came home once more, this time without warning. Mrs. T., who was not earning enough to support her children, was in despair. She took two tiny rooms, one of them the kitchen, where she did sewing. T. remained for a few days and then went off again. After a search of several days they found him badly hurt in the City Hospital. In due time the fifth child was born. Since then T. has been kept at Worcester, without improvement. Unfortunately the woman is not well enough to earn the money she needs, and has taken to the easy way of self-support which many of her sex have adopted under desperate circumstances. Her children are all unhealthy.

Conditions like the above are inhuman and ought not to exist in a country like ours. What steps can be taken to prevent such horrors? The only alternative to them seems to be an additional amendment to our divorce law. To propose such an amendment opens the sluice-gates to a sea of questions and arguments. But may not such an amendment be desirable? At present, insanity is a complete defense to suits for divorce on any grounds. In 1912 the Royal Commission on Divorce and Matrimonial Causes brought this question for the first time squarely to the attention of the House of Commons. Their report is one of the best arguments made in the English lauguage in favor of making incurable insanity a ground for divorce. It proposes divorce only after five years of uninterrupted illness. In the United Kingdom there were then about 150,000 insane persons of whom perhaps 60,000 or 70,000 were married. Sir Thomas Clouston of Edinburgh stated that should incurable mental disease become a cause for divorce some 41,000 married people might be released by the change in the law, the exact number depending on the number of years during which insanity must have existed before the divorce was made possible. According to his report relating to patients sent to the Royal Edinburgh Asylum from 1874-1908 inclusive, 36.4 percent recovered, but less than 2 percent recovered after five years illness.

Unfortunately the war prevented England from passing such a law as the Royal Commission recommended. I looked through the Parliamentary Debates from 1913-1920 finding the question mentioned before the House of Commons only twice, once in 1913, and once in 1914. The last time Mr. Boland said "This is not the time for such action."

There are eight European countries where incurable insanity is reason for divorce, i. e. Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Bulgaria, Germany, Switzerland, Russia, and Portugal. New Zealand and Western Australia have similar statutes. All these countries investigated this question for years before they adopted their laws.

We have also three states in this country where a divorce is granted on account of incurable insanity, i. e. Idaho, Utah, and Washington (Idaho Compiled Statutes, Section 4627; Utah Compiled Laws, Section 2995; Washington, Pierce's Code, 1919, Section 7501). I wrote to the authorities in these states to ask how many applications had been filed, and received this answer:

STATE MENTAL HOSPITAL
Provo, Utah.

We consider the provision in our compiled laws of 1917, Section 2995, for divorce in the case of permanent insanity after five years' confinement in our institution as a very wise and practical measure.

At present we have 586 insane persons in this institution, 298 single, 186 married, 78 widowed, and 26 divorced. We had five cases take advantage of this Section during last year and have had four so far this year. The interests of our patients are always properly safeguarded when the question of divorce is brought into court under the above section.

(Signed) George E. Hyde, M.D.
Superintendent.

Idaho and Washington reported no statistics were available.

It is a fact and a very sad fact that the number of divorces has latterly increased and to add a new ring to the long chain of causes is—perhaps a larger step towards civilization. We must consider human nature in its variety, and deal with it accordingly. Our prevailing law grants a divorce on sentence to prison for five years or desertion for three years, whereas commitment to an insane asylum perhaps for a lifetime shuts off any possible prospect of freedom for a person married to an insane husband or wife. Life comes but once, and we all have a right to enjoy it. To the wife or husband of an incurably insane person such right is denied.

It is entirely against the interest of the other struggling partner to be tied against his or her will to one hopelessly insane, and entirely against the interest of the children, if there are children. Our advanced hygienic conditions of treating the patient according to his form of illness tend to prolong the life of the sufferer and the suffering of the unfortunate spouse. The larger class of married persons who are hopelessly insane suffer from secondary dementia. "Of such it is said that they have no proper interest in life, are quite unable to care for themselves or to manage their affairs. This condition, when fully established, is absolutely incurable, while most of those patients live for many years. They have so lost the power of proper feeling that the fact of their divorce would make no painful impression on their minds, or no impression at all. . . . To them their wives or husbands are as strangers, and indeed, these subjects of dementia are, except in a physiological sense, practically dead."

Such amendment as I propose must be backed by the moral sentiment of the people. Is it not becoming more and more necessary that the public should consider this question, particularly now that Congress has begun hearings as to the advisability of a contitutional amendment authorizing a uniform divorce law throughout the country? I have petitioned the General Court in Massachusetts for such change in the law as would make possible a divorce from a person hopelessly insane who has been confined continuously in an asylum for the five years next preceding the filing of the libel and I should be very glad of support at the hearing.

EDWARD B. ADAMS.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Loss of Faith in the League

SIR: In your issue of June 7th you discuss the future of the League of Nations with special reference to the possibility of the United States joining it at some future time. If the writer has not misunderstood the article, you consider yourselves friends of the League and desire to promote membership by this country in the same. The writer of these lines remembers all too well his enthusiasm for the League as originally conceived or rather as he understood it to be. His naïve faith has since then been rudely shaken and he fails to understand how any liberal can continue his belief in the League; it seems to him that Vilna, Upper Silesia, the racial minorities in Poland, Czecho-Slovakia *et al.*, not to forget the so-called "mandated territories" ought to have opened everybody's eyes to what the League really means.

New York City. R. SMITH.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books and Things

AMONG his early memories he could never find, either by poking and sifting or by turning some happy corner accidentally, anything at all like a first impression of Boston. Boston was so near the place where he was born that he seemed never to have entered it for the first time. It was the home of tedious shops, shops in which grownups could never finish their business of buying you clothes you didn't quite like, and your patience in which, if you neither yawned too often nor got lost, might possibly be rewarded, later in the endless morning, by ice cream and German chocolate at Weber's in Temple Place. When you were old enough to go to town by yourself there were more glorious pleasures in waiting. If you went to your father's office, about half past twelve, and stood by his desk, the chances were good of his asking you to lunch at Young's, where they gave manly food to boys, slices of roast beef as thick as two griddle cakes. Later still, as courage was built upon fear, you explored the North End, where the streets tied themselves into knots that were new at each visit, and where everybody you saw might be a ruffian in disguise or a criminal. The South End too, although perfectly depressing, was interesting because of the character it bore as the home of outcasts who were forced to live in a part of town that "nobody" lived in, and who looked disappointingly like other people.

New York was the first city to leave a first impression. He went there, travelling alone, when he was twelve, and a friendly cousin met him at the station and showed him the sights. They went down town on the elevated, a structure much too high for safety and south of Washington Square alarmingly curved; they heard the Stock Exchange make one noise out of its many noises; they visited a theatre, where the play was Aunt Jack, and where his cousin, who was obviously as good as gold and more obviously a grown person, laughed without shame at a joke that sounded indecent. Scales fell, vistas opened, a generalization took shape in his head: there are some indecent jokes that even a gentleman may laugh at. To be filed for reference. This thought, memories of brown stone straight streets all alike, of noise, of frowzy women hanging bed clothes out of upper windows—he took nothing else back to Boston, whose Chestnut Street and Mt. Vernon Street had grown dearer than before, and older, and looked as if people who liked them had lived there a long while. Real New York contradicted no imaginary New York. He had travelled toward it without pictures in his head, with no expectation of anything but the unknown.

Nor did London, visited for the first time when he was sixteen, efface the picture he had been for several years accumulating. London was as wonderful as you please, but its only strangeness was that it wasn't strange. It matched, amazingly, the London which engravings in oldish books, which maps and photographs of buildings had given him. Never, not even in the country at home, at no bend of any New Hampshire river, had the "I have been here before" feeling had an edge so sharp, and the feeling lasted as long as the statement was untrue, through more than a week of proving the expected way about intricate streets to be the right way, of seeing almost nothing unforeseen except cutaways everywhere and silk hats. The full tide of life at Charing Cross ought not to look like that. Not like that did it look to Dr. Johnson, whom he tried to follow from Gray's Inn to Inner Temple Lane, from Johnson Court to Bolt Court. In Bolt Court he took his stand and listened for the sound of Dr. Johnson buffeting his books. To hear it would have been scarcely a surprise, nor to hear it cease, nor to hear Dr. Johnson roar, as he roared on that day when Mrs. Williams reluctantly consented to let him dine at Mr. Dilly's, "Frank, a clean shirt!"

This experience was never repeated. For the most part he discovered, as we have all discovered again and again, that each new city first contradicted the picture he hadn't known he had of it, and then wiped the pictured city out. This happened in Paris, of which the image had come to him he couldn't say from where, and in Florence, many years later. Bits of real Florence were all right, of course. Nobody could live for twenty years in Boston and escape photographs brought back by maiden and widowed relatives. But Florence as a whole, imagined years ago while reading Romola, as a place you touched the stones of with your feet—five minutes in the real city were enough to make that imaginary city irrecoverable. Only Siena has survived contact with reality. There are still two Sienas. One of them is a low, pointed hill, a cone of houses close together, tan or olive-pale, with small straight streets as steep as the back streets of San Remo. Not a green thing grows in this ascetic Siena. The people you see there are nearly all men, nearly all the men are monks, nearly all the monks wear cowls. The Sienese doctors will let you die there unless you are a Roman Catholic, and nobody ever learns what they do with your dead body. The real Siena is a better place.

Once in a while the process is reversed, and an imaginary city takes the real city's place. He is never the sole maker of such a picture. He needs help, which came, in the case of Manhattan, from the drawing of an architect who once saw the island as a city of towers, of Woolworth, Metropolitan and other campanili, each detached, each standing well away from the others, with plenty of space and light and air. No low building except the Pennsylvania Station and possibly the Grand Central, no dwelling anywhere on the island, not even a "palatial residence," and no surface traffic. All the traffic would be underground, and would send up, from its slightly nether world, a deep-throbbing hum. There would be no other sound except the water-side noises and the steamers' whistling, and of course the beating of the pavement by how many million feet? For there would be many walkers about this city, and no crowd at any point. Will this change ever take place? Possibly. Unless " 'tis too late to be ambitious," unless "the great mutations of the world are acted, or time may be too short for our designs." No matter. Such predictions of a better New York may be made with the greater assurance, since no one alive now will live long enough to be quite certain they will never come true.

And the new city's inhabitants? If popular vote could decide the question they would look, I infer from the popular magazines, like movie actresses, society girls who had seen the hollowness of an artificial life, and youngish men who had all played football at college. For my part, I should be much less exacting. All the nations of the world, all races, all ages, all occupations would be free to send their representatives to work in the towers of Manhattan, and to wander about the large squares at the towers' feet. I would exclude no one, not even the descendants of native New Yorkers. But upon one point I should be firm. The women must have pleasant voices, and all the men must be freshly shaved. P. L.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Limitations of Political Science

Studies in History and Politics, by the Right Honorable Herbert Fisher. Oxford: Clarendon Press. $4.20.
Law in the Modern State, by Léon Duguit. New York: B. W. Huebsch. $2.50.
The Foundations of Sovereignty, by Harold J. Laski. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company $3.50.

IT is one of the ironies of fate that concentrated study, so essential to real achievement in any field, tends also to make us lose the right perspective as to the relation of our chosen field to life as a whole. We readily recognize this irony in the old-time humanists who, to open up the treasures of ancient literature, had to devote their lives to the intricacies of Latin syntax, so that they naturally came to regard Latin prose composition as the centre of all human education. Can it be that the modern humanist engaged in the study of politics is entirely free from this irony of fate? The three masterly books before us afford much food for reflection in this regard.

The first book is by the distinguished historian of the Republican Tradition in Europe. As historian, essayist and statesman, Mr. Fisher continues the great tradition of Macaulay, Bryce and Morley—a tradition of wide and accurate learning, cautious and sound judgment, mildly liberal aspirations, and a gentlemanly silence about the grimy soil of human nature and selfish interests, in which questions of public policy have their roots if not their justification. Thus Mr. Fisher explains carefully and frankly why British administration in India is the costliest in the world. But the economic and social effects of this government of India, on Great Britain as well as on India itself, are ignored.

Mr. Fisher knows too much history and actual politics to fall into the view of amateurs, that our fragmentary knowledge of the past can directly solve for us the perplexing problems of the present. History is rather a field in which to apply and thus develop our political judgment and imagination. For the soul of history is not so much the acquisition and arrangement of material as the exercise of insight and appreciation. Mr. Fisher's own insight thus manifests itself in his reflections on particular events or issues. Typical of the best of these is the observation that while arbitration cannot banish war it can diminish the accumulation of minor grievances. At other times, however, we have comments like the following: Military conscription is an honorable duty to the state, a school of patriotic virtue, etc.; but though it unified Prussia it has "given a military direction to the thoughts, feelings, and aspirations of a vigorous people."

In the main, Mr. Fisher represents the school which views history as predominantly a matter of politics. The weakness of this in concrete cases shows itself in the essay on Lord Acton, which leaves us without any explanation of the relative barrenness of that prodigiously learned man. One wonders what Mr. Fisher himself thinks of Lord Acton's amazing judgment that George Eliot is the greatest figure in literature since the death of Goethe.

Mr. Fisher shows eminent good sense in explaining why Rousseau prevailed so decidedly despite his obvious limitations. Instead of wasting excessive ingenuity on this point, as do most writers on Rousseau nowadays, Fisher relies rather on the obvious fact that Rousseau was right, that he was attacking an unjust and corrupt order which richly deserved to be overthrown. It is a pity, however, that an historian should repeat the popular myth that Rousseau's Social Contract was "founded on imaginary history." The second sentence of that book—so often referred to but so seldom read—amply refutes that charge.

No one can read through Mr. Fisher's book without a feeling that it deserves the honorific epithets which the author himself is so fond of applying, viz: thorough, solid, robust and masculine. The latter term occurs so often as to suggest by contrast why this and other admirable books on politics by Bryce, Morley, etc., are after all somewhat dull—they lack what Goethe calls the eternally feminine which ever draws or lures us on.

Professor Duguit's book is more unified not only because it has a single theme but even more so by the fact that it has a definite thesis to maintain. In his predilection for general ideas, Duguit is as typically French as Fisher is English in his cautious avoidance of them. This is all the more significant in that Duguit restricts himself to the field of law and professes adherence to strict scientific methods and a positivistic abhorrence for metaphysics. His positivism, however, like most positivisms turns out to be not a greater respect for facts but rather a zeal for dogmas that are sharply antithetic to the old dogmas. If the older theories of law are individualistic, subjective and moralistic, the new theory must be collectivistic, objective and realistic. Of course, a trained and accomplished scholar can readily find many facts to show that this is the trend of history. Doubtless also the new dogmas explain some facts better than did the old ones. But what Duguit naïvely ignores is that history cares little for the comfort of theorists, even of the positivistic kind, and brings forth plenty of facts to comfort and confound both sides. Thus the individualist can point to various forms of property which used to be communal but which are now individual, to family obligations which have been modified in the interests of greater individual freedom, and many similar considerations. Duguit can readily show that the will of the state or people, which is the alleged basis of legal sovereignty, is a metaphysical fiction. But he states more than he can prove when he asserts in opposition that all law originates not in any human will but in the objective conditions that are necessary for the public service. The obvious fact is that many laws are passed because some people want them though these laws may not aid the public service in the least and may in fact hinder it. The citizen who would disregard these laws because Duguit says that such enactments have no legal force, will find himself in serious trouble with the law. Duguit's anti-moralistic bias, based on a superficial theory that science can deal with only what is and never with what ought to be, cuts him off from any consistent argument as to what ought to be the law. His assertion that the objective conditions of social cooperation themselves dictate all the law is just as mythical as the social will which he rejects. Laws are in fact made by definite human beings and in accordance with their desires, prejudices, perceptions, etc., and wilful or unwilful ignorance of the objective conditions of good laws is certainly a patent fact in actual law-making. So long as human beings, devoid of omniscience, have to guess as to what will be the effect of their enactments, the adaptation of laws to the public service will always remain something to be desired rather than something completely achieved.

Duguit tries to save his doctrine of the legal nullity of statutes that do not promote the public service, by argu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing that courts should have the power to declare certain statutes unconstitutional. As a positivist he cannot say they *ought* to do so, nor that in France they actually do so; he can only affirm his own guess that they will do so in the future. It is interesting, however, to note that Duguit, like the defenders of the judicial power in this country, argues on a priori logic, not on the basis of the actual results which have ensued from the American practice of having the opinion of courts prevail over the combined opinion of legislature and executive as to the meaning of the constitution. Certainly, no one has as yet shown that where courts have overruled the legislature and executive their decisions have always rested on sounder views and more thorough knowledge as to the actual needs of the situation.

Duguit's book is undoubtedly keen, learned, lively and instructive. He is especially illuminating in showing how people are actually governed by the rules of private corporations, etc. In the main he has sound moral views and stands strongly for the rights of minorities and other rights of man. But his doctrinaire positivism compels him to chase all rights and moral considerations rather ostentatiously through the front door, only to let them in surreptitiously through a back door. The futility of this unedifying proceeding becomes obvious when we realize that by no hocus pocus can we extract from a mere description of the *facts that are* a description of *what ought to be*. If "what should be" is not contained in our premises, it cannot be logically found in our conclusions.

Mr. Laski combines the English historical with the French theoretical method of approach to political discussion—readers of the New Republic hardly need to be told that he writes with a learning and vivacious enthusiasm all his own. It was in these columns that Mr. Laski burst upon the American scene six years ago, a dashing young Lochinvar, who soon made us feel that our official custodians of political science were somewhat passé. Nevertheless, though it is impossible to read this book of Mr. Laski without admiration for many telling points, his main ideas as to the nature of sovereignty are by no means clear or convincing. In his zeal to overthrow old views he does not stop to analyze them carefully, and he fails to discriminate between sovereignty as a legal concept and the historic fact of actual political power. No one has maintained that any actual human government is in fact omnipotent and can achieve anything at all that it wishes to. The essence of the traditional doctrine of sovereignty is that, in applying the law, a judge or administrative official must not allow the rules of any church, trade union or any other body to prevail over the law of the state which he is sworn to enforce. Obviously, if the law of the state could at any time be set aside by private groups within it, there would be no use in having any common system of law and courts. I do not know whether Mr. Laski now disputes the necessity for this sovereignty of the state law in its own courts, though in his two earlier books he seemed to argue that the law might or should be set aside when it conflicts with individual conscience or the doctrines of some church —a proposal which would lead to legal anarchy. When Mr. Laski now argues for plural sovereignty, he seems to have in mind a political scheme by which the central political authority will give up the attempt to legislate on all matters and leave a great many things to be determined by private corporations and syndicates. On this point he makes many telling arguments, especially in the admirable essay on Administrative Areas. But to my understanding, few modern writers deny that our legislatures are overloaded and incompetent to pass on the bewildering variety of all the phases of modern life. If Mr. Laski were to content himself with urging such delegation of legislative power to the extent that it proves feasible, few would disagree with him. Such devolution of legislative power is in no way inconsistent with the sovereignty of the law. For any arrangement by which it would be effected would itself become part of the organic law of the state. But Mr. Laski does not seem to be willing to urge his program as a working hypothesis, to be tried wherever it serves vital needs. He must needs defend it with the dogma of pluralistic sovereignty, and of the real personality of corporations. Thereby he gets himself into gratuitous trouble. You cannot cure the evils of monistic absolutism by multiplying the number of absolute sovereigns, and the belief in the actual personality of every corporation subjects him to the taunt of turning what is a legal fiction into a communal ghost.

Common fairness compels us to add that Mr. Laski's good sense frequently makes him arrive at sound conclusions despite his inadequate dogmas. Thus in his valuable essay on Vicarious Liability he has no hesitation in speaking of the "impersonality" of large corporations employing thousands of men. But Mr. Laski ignores entirely the grave dangers to the freedom of the individual involved in his pluralistic regime, though it is a notorious fact that local tyrants can, if not interfered with from without, oppress us far more effectively than a tyrannous central government. Modern monarchies did not arise, as one might suppose from certain unguarded statements of Mr. Laski (p. 295), because people at the time of the counter-reformation fell in love with the concept of unity. Modern monarchies arose because the tyranny of one king was the effective means whereby modern enterprise was liberated from the more oppressive tyrannies of local barons and guilds. This is a capital fact which all those who preach a return to mediaevalism should not ignore.

The limitations of Mr. Laski's contributions to politics, despite their brilliance and soundness in many details, are in a measure due to the English guides whom he follows with too uncritical an enthusiasm. Maitland, for instance, was undoubtedly a rare genius in the exercise of historic imagination, in recreating out of apparently insignificant details the whole living situation as it must have occurred in the past. But he had no particular aptitude in political analysis, and even less can be said about his venture in the metaphysics of corporations. Mr. Laski's enthusiasm for Acton and Figgis leads him to attach undue importance to the present political significance of obscure figures in the Conciliar movement and similar incidents in the history of the Catholic church. Mr. Laski would have done better to study actual political federalism in Canada, Australia, Germany and Switzerland or local administration in Austria before the war. The steady growth of nationalism in the United States, and the progressive decadence of the importance of state governments, is certainly of greater significance for Mr. Laski's theses than the writings of Withrington or James I. I venture to think that Mr. Laski might not so readily have overlooked fundamental distinctions if he had been somewhat more familiar with German political science and discussion, e. g., the work of Gumplowicz and Simmel. Even Mr. Laski's references to Gierke are to views filtred through Maitland and Figgis. He cer-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tainly gets nothing of Gierke's reverence for the state, nothing of Gierke's intense nationalism, which is the basis of the latter's championing German against Roman law. Clearly sentimental attachment to country or national state which has its basis in literature and tradition gives the state power which other groups do not have.

In the main, however, I think the limitations of both Mr. Laski's and M. Duguit's books are due to a craving for absolute distinctions, which is apt to be strongest in those not devoted to technical philosophy. The public demands it of those engaged in political discussion. People generally cannot get enthusiastic for tentative policies and reserved statements. They crave absolute certainty from the statesman as well as from the physician and the priest. That is why the most influential factors in the world's political discussion have been absolutistic theologians like Calvin, doctrinaire Hegelians like Karl Marx or classificatory zoologists like Aristotle—not to mention certain non-political but disturbing remarks in a famous sermon on the Mount. But in justice to Mr. Laski it should be mentioned that he recognizes that "man is no less a solitary than a social creature."

MORRIS R. COHEN.

Agonized Adoration

Priapus and the Pool, by Conrad Aiken. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Dunster House. $2.50.

CONRAD AIKEN has generally moved in a world of dusk, darkness, and dimly-lit rooms, but Priapus and the Pool gives a different impression. Here are green waters, blue skies, and sunlight flashing on leaves. Yet it is not a joyous brightness. It is a brilliant setting for frustration, for the inability of man in the flesh completely to seize either love or beauty.

The title poem is haunting work, full of shadowy suggestion and fluctuant music, and its very vagueness of meaning is a charm. One does not seek the logical place in a chain of thought of such a passage as this about the pool:

I will not say it is not sometimes troubled!
It is very old; strange things are imaged there.
Out of its depths at night the stars have bubbled;
And into those depths maidens have hung their hair.
Leaves have fallen into it without number
And never been found again. . . .
Birds have sung above it in the ancient trees. . . .
And sometimes raindrops fall upon it, and then
There are rings of silver upon it, spreading and fading,
Delicately intersecting. . . .
But if you return again when the sky is cloudless,
You will find it clear again, and coldly reflecting. . . .
Reflecting the silent trees of the ancient forest,
And the ancient leaves, ready to fall once more,
And the blue sky under the leaves, old and empty,
And the savage grasses along the shore.

. . .

But can a pool remember its reflections?
That is the thing that troubles me!

But as the sequence of poems which follows this prologue unfolds, its meaning, dimly grasped at the start, grows clearer and richer. Man struggles in "The delicate imperfections of this mesh," and beauty, symbolized first in the pool, remains serene and unaware; untouched by the agonized adoration which surrounds her.

To say that the love sequence which follows this prologue is pleasant reading would be false. Rather it is beautiful reading—all of Mr. Aiken's fine gift of music and visual fancy being called into play to make lovely a theme rooted in pain. It is the old story of hopeless love (which the reader may or may not interpret as symbolic of love for beauty) with the poet at once crying, "It is enough that I know you and love you. Anguish is good for the soul," and spasmodically revolting from that love.

The twenty-five poems which make up the sequence are each complete in themselves and yet each serves, as it should, to develop the central theme. The reviewer to give their quality can only quote.

The thrush on the bough is silent, the dew falls softly,
In the evening is hardly a sound.
And three beautiful pilgrims who come here together
Touch lightly the dust of the ground.

Touch it with feet that trouble the dust but as wings do,
Come shyly together, are still,
Like dancers who wait, in a pause of the music, for music
The exquisite silence to fill. . . .

This is the thought of the first, and this of the second,
And this the grave thought of the third:
'Linger we thus for a moment, palely expectant,
And silence will end, and the bird

'Sing the pure phrase, sweet phrase, clear phrase in the twilight
To fill the blue bell of the world;
And we, who on music so leaflike have drifted together,
Leaflike apart shall be whirled

'Into what but the beauty of silence, silence forever?'

Or this passage following three stanzas which powerfully describe the desolation of the land:

Sometimes, perhaps, from other lands more happy,
A faint wind, slow, exhausted, ventures there,
And loses itself in silence, like a music. . . .
And then—who knows?—beneath that alien air,

Which moves mysteriously as memory over
Forlorn abysms and peaks of stone and sand,
Ghosts of delight wake for a shining moment,
And all is troubled, and that desolate land

Remembers grass and flowers, and birds that sang there
Their miracles of song in lovely trees,
And waters that poured, or stood, in dreaming azure,
Praising the sky. Perhaps once more it sees

The rose, the moon, the pool, in the blue evening,
And knows that silence in which one bird will sing
Slowly and sleepily his praise of gardens. . . .
Perhaps once more, for a moment, it remembers spring.

The volume is typical of Mr. Aiken at his best. It is, as most of his work, beauty drawn from pain. It has his reliance upon a suggestive, tangential approach to his theme (contrasting with the direct, explicit approach) his sense of atmosphere, and, above all, his exquisite sureness of music.

ROYALL SNOW.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kimono

Kimono, by John Paris. New York: Boni and Liveright. $2.00.

WHAT, asks Lady Georgie, is the greatest shock for a foreign traveler who goes to Japan? The Yoshiwara, says the young diplomat who has been there. And there you have the whole world of difference in the outlook of East and West. Life? Morals. Morals? Sex. Sex? Adultery. Thus the West at its Westernmost, which is Anglo-Saxondom. So it is the Yoshiwara that fills the vista of Japan for the Occidental traveler and against the Yoshiwara that the Occidental novelist moves the beings of his creating when he would represent the life of Japan; the Yoshiwara being the famous licensed quarter of Tokio.

Kimono is a novel of modern Japanese life. It is a good novel, the best in fact that has been done in English with a Far Eastern setting. It alone is on a level of maturity in conception and execution. The others are crude or sensational or mawkishly soft. It is veracious also, being an honest attempt to deal with life in an Oriental country as it is lived by the inhabitants thereof, life seen without the vulgar prejudices of the commercials of the semi-foreign trading ports or the romancings of the exquisites of the Lafcadio Hearn type. But life, also, of Anglo-Saxon envisaging; quite naturally, since the author is an Anglo-Saxon. John Paris, incidentally, is the pseudonym of a former attaché of the British embassy in Tokio.

A young Englishman of the nobility marries in London a charming emigrée who had left Japan in infancy and grown to womanhood a European in thought and habit. On an impulse they decide while on their honeymoon to go to Japan. The rest is the story of their divergent response to the life they discover there. Hers, of course, is first shock and then awakening of race memories and the call of her kind. His also is shock and then repulsion and the awakening of race antipathy. The divergence is widened by the machinations of her clan, united against the alien intruder, and made irreparable by his discovery that the income which his bride has brought as her dot and by which he is supported is derived from the Yoshiwara, which her family controls. There the author has unfortunately labored his point. He has made of the Yoshiwara and the difference in the racial attitudes toward it an element of personal melodrama rather than a tragic racial chasm. At any rate, husband and wife are sundered, but finally happily reunited. There the story loses some of its dignity. Its pacing is forced toward the close and dashed to a happy ending through attempted seductions, murder, dungeon cells, torture and not a little coincidence. The author, having marched resolutely and with logical progression through three-quarters of his novel, becomes panicky in the last quarter and leaps out of his entanglement of plot, hands on bootstraps.

The purely fictive art of the work, however, is of lesser importance, serving only as a road leading to the heights and depths of Japanese life. John Paris walks this road irreverently and destructively. He strips the glamour of temple and teahouse, torii and cherry blossom, all the tender nonsense of the Madame Butterfly school. By some, therefore, including many Japanese, he will be called anti-Japanese and Kimono will be dismissed at that. If he is, then Sinclair Lewis is anti-American. Yet it is as an Anglo-Saxon that John Paris walks and on sex that he fixes his vision most searchingly; on sex as reflected in the Yoshiwara and the Japanese attitude toward what it represents. What distinguishes the Yoshiwara from similar quarters in Europe and America is outwardly its vividness, its colorfulness, its air of public carnival. In that word public lies the fundamental distinction, both as to the Yoshiwara and sex generally. In our cities the "restricted district" is furtive and leering, unacknowledged and unmentionable. In Japan it is an institution like any other institution, a locale of one recognized trade. It is as if one should say, here is our fish market, here our ivory market, here our silk market, and there our flesh market. Men buy flesh as they buy food and raiment. What is there to deny or palliate? Hence the public processions to which respectable Japanese and foreign tourists come, the lack of small concealments as to just what is being sold and the brutal frankness that there is such a sale. So the festoons of light blaze gaily in the broad streets by contrast with the silent drabness of the city proper, a thousand samisens tinkle in the tiny gardens behind each entrance, the shadows of dancers play gracefully on the paper shoji that screen the balconies, and the thousands of painted little things resplendent in gorgeous kimonos and hair piled high sit on open display behind wooden bars in the open windows before each house, an unforgettable scene, pictorially lovely. But before each window a warped and lewd-tongued barker cries the physical charms of each exhibit and her price to the prospective purchasers who throng by, and the exotic and charming spectacle becomes a horrible sacrifice to some god of bestiality.

But if the scene repels more than similar scenes elsewhere, it is only by reason of the lack of concealment. The purpose and operation of the institution are the same everywhere. So also with the larger question of sex, beyond that of prostitution. "I have got a wife, you know," says Geoffrey, the English husband, to a young Japanese who is inciting him to experiment with a geisha at a feast given by the family of his bride. "No matter, no matter," the young man answers, "we all have wife; wife no matter in Japan." Truly it is no matter, not even to the wife, who accepts the fact as divinely ordained and immutable. Repellent? Of course. But there also by reason of lack of concealment or palliative. Where else does the wife matter in similar circumstances? A little more or less here and there, with a difference only in degree.

I am not disposed to argue that their frankness is the more honest and therefore commendable; or that our concealment is not the more merciful and also commendable because symptomatic of an aspiration to betterment—if it really is that and not merely the salving of our conscience and the pretense that we really believe our pretenses and therefore are acquitted of the obligation that the professed ideal entails. The question is nicely illumined, though with ironic light, by the recent history of the Yoshiwara itself. The Yoshiwara that Kimono depicts, the Yoshiwara of ten years ago, is no more. It is reformed. It is no longer a public carnival. It is still there, but the public part has been closed. Why? Because the Japanese have seen the error of their ways and strive now toward the purity of more civilized peoples? Hardly. Because the Yoshiwara looked so bad in foreign eyes. It gave Japan a bad name. As Lady Georgie learns, it was the most shocking thing to travelers in Japan. To the Yoshiwara all tourists went first, for of it they had heard most. If they were but travellers passing through on their way to other Far Eastern lands, they saw the Yoshiwara only. And

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whether they saw more or that only, it was of that they reported most voluminously to the male folks at home. So Japan got a bad name—the name it undoubtedly has. If you go to a Jap's home, as the international drummers relate in the smoking saloons of Pacific steamers, why, if you go to a Jap's home, "Here," he says to you, "you're a nice man, here's my wife—or would you rather have my daughter?" So Japan got a bad name, as being immoral. It lost face, and now that Japan is in the family of civilized nations it is sensitive of appearances. So the government prohibited the public activities of the Yoshiwara. And there are no more processions, the streets are silent and no brighter than any other streets, there is no more vividness, the young girls no longer sit in the open windows in their bright kimonos, there are no more barkers. The tourists no longer go to see. It is no longer repellent. There is no more shock to Occidental morality. But the transactions there prosecuted are just as they were ten years ago, and no less.

One more pertinent observation remains. Kimono as Americans will read it is not Kimono as it was originally written. The American edition has been expurgated. Certain realistic passages, like those describing the notorious Chonkina dance, have been excised out of the English edition as beneath American moral standards. But—the jacket on the English edition has a modest illustration of a young Japanese girl amid cherry blossoms, while the jacket on the American edition has an illustration of three obviously immoral Japanese young ladies, semi-nude and altogether lewd. And the Japanese prints, which originated as the portrayal of the women of the Yoshiwara and the Geisha, are as chaste as magazine covers. And still I am not disposed to argue anything.

NATHANIEL PEFFER.

Prison Shadows

Wall Shadows: A Study in American Prisons, by Frank Tannenbaum. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. $2.00.

PRISONS of one type or another have existed since Joseph was incarcerated for having resisted the amorous advances of Potiphar's wife, indeed, since the days of primitive cannibalism, but only during the last century have they been used as the essential basis of the punishment of those convicted of crime. From the days of John Howard and Jeremy Bentham the prison problem has received the thoughtful attention of some of the best minds which have been devoted to social betterment. The list of Americans who have contributed to the science and practice of penology, such as Louis Dwight, Richard Vaux, Francis Lieber, E. C. Wines, T. W. Dwight, F. B. Sanborn, S. J. Barrows, C. R. Henderson, G. W. Kirchwey, T. M. Osborne and others, is one of which we may well be proud. During the last year we have had two very notable additions to the literature of American penology which, fortunately, admirably supplement each other. Dr. Louis N. Robinson, of the Philadelphia Municipal Court, in his Penology in the United States, has produced an excellent systematic survey of the development and present state of penal science and administration in this country. Mr. Tannenbaum's book, while in no sense a comprehensive factual survey of American penology, is an invaluable interpretation of the spirit and methods of the actual operation of American prisons, and brings out the sombre fact that the real progress of the new penology is far less in practice than the volume of legislative achievement, as given in Dr. Robinson's work, would seem to indicate.

We have long needed just such a work as Mr. Tannenbaum has produced—one which reveals the sinister spirit of the old repressive penal administration and presents convincing evidence that this system still dominates the majority of American prisons, in spite of the popular presentiment that we are entering an era characterized by the "coddling of prisoners." Alexander Berkman's Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist was a valuable contribution to this indispensable interpretative literature of actual penology, but the limitations of the author were real and his generalizations were based chiefly upon experiences in one prison—the Western Penitentiary of Pennsylvania. Mr. Osborne's works, valuable as they are, were the product of an advocate, albeit an enlightened advocate, of a particular phase of penal reform. Mr. Tannenbaum's volume is sufficiently objective, and founded upon wide enough observation to make it both comprehensive and reliable.

Mr. Tannenbaum writes as a disciple of Mr. Osborne, who contributes an appreciative introduction to the book. The author first discusses the psychology of prison cruelty, indicating that it is a result of the mediocre type of human being who becomes the conventional prison guard, of the ignorance on the part of most wardens and guards of even the elementary principles of social and penal science, of the fact that the prison administrators under the existing system must inevitably regard themselves as primarily jailers and disciplinary officials, and of the tendency of the officers, like the prisoners, to succumb to the vicious system of isolation and repression and to lose whatever sentiments of humanity and kindliness they may originally have possessed. Next comes an excellent discussion of the nature, implications and achieved results of prison democracy, as realized through Mr. Osborne's system of inmate self-government. The progressive student of penology will dissent chiefly, if at all, from Mr. Tannenbaum's apparent opinion that the "professional criminal" is usually sound physically and mentally, is the victim solely of an unfortunate social environment, and may almost invariably be reclaimed by a system of social re-education. An interesting chapter is contributed on the old repressive system of prison administration, as it is in operation today in most American prisons. The facts were gathered on a recent transcontinental tour of investigation, and will constitute an illuminating and salutary disillusionment to those who had believed that considerable practical progress had been made in introducing the more scientific and humane methods of the newer penology. In his closing chapter Mr. Tannenbaum outlines the desirable changes in the old system. He presents nothing new, but does set forth most of the conventional program of the progressive penologists—the development of a trained profession of prison administration, the abandonment of the idea of punishment and repression and of the old type of prison plant, the substitution of prison farms, industrial prisons and extra-mural employment, the provision of adequate machinery for academic, industrial and social education, and a wider use of the indeterminate sentence and parole. Singularly enough, nothing is said about the sex problem in penology, and students will continue to have to rely for their information on this subject upon the somewhat morbid analysis in Berkman's work.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Few informed persons will quarrel with Mr. Tannenbaum's proposals, but they will not be sanguine as to the rapidity with which they will be realized, in the face of public ignorance, stupidity and perversity. Only education and enlightened propaganda can achieve much in hastening the process, and a wide circulation of Wall Shadows should contribute much to this desirable end.

HARRY ELMER BARNES.

Country Children

Rural Child Welfare. An Inquiry by the National Child Labor Committee under the direction of Edward N. Clopper, Ph.D. New York: The Macmillan Co. $5.00.

EVERY day's mail brings to me, as member of a State Board of Education, two or three letters from conscientious women, asking me how they can make themselves useful in "doing something for the schools and for school children." From now on I shall always begin my answer by advising them to read and to study this admirable book, quite as instructive, suggestive and stimulating for country dwellers in Vermont or Minnesota or Indiana, as for those in West Virginia, about whom it is written.

It is a satisfaction to have such an excellent model to place in the hands of people, willing and ready to do what they can to enrich and protect child life, but wholly uninformed as to facts, and what is more serious, wholly untrained in methods of determining facts. The scientific spirit of exact thoroughness which animates the book will be a tonic revelation to hazy-minded people of good intentions, who cannot fail to profit by such an example of how to investigate a situation intelligently before attempting to cope with it, of how to state your problem clearly, coherently and completely before trying to solve it.

This book does better than provide a good recipe for this sort of work; it takes its readers out into the kitchen and lets them stand by to watch the whole progress of putting the recipe into execution; the materials used and the conditions of work being exactly what any country-dweller has to handle.

This does not mean that the conditions found in West Virginia, and so accurately and sympathetically set down in this book, are exactly reproduced in Vermont, Minnesota or Indiana. On the contrary, every reader will find occasional pages on which he can make the the relieved comment, "Well, it's not so bad as that, here," (and yet, even at that, let him not be too sure till he has covered with the thoroughness of this investigation even a very small district of the state he thinks he knows intimately). Nor does it mean that every reader will agree with every conclusion reached by the careful, thoughtful investigators of West Virginia. Personally I do not at all agree, either in theory or practice, with their sweeping, unqualified endorsement of school-consolidation as the only way to improve rural primary schools.

But, though the reader like myself may never have set foot in West Virginia, he will not find a page in the book over which he can slide comfortably without being stung into doing some thinking. He will find a recognition and statement there of many a problem of American rural child-life, which until now he, along with all other American country-dwellers, has blandly ignored because of its familiarity. A good example of this is the plain, truthful, unexaggerated statement of the practically universal failure of the present truant system to get rural children regularly to school. Everybody who has ever lived in the country knows that it does not work, and never has worked, and never can work, till something is done about it. We all know, too, that it fails because of the network of close personal relations in country life. But we have all looked the other way, and kept a profound silence on this failure as one of the explanations for the astounding amount of illiteracy revealed by the recent army census. City dwellers (almost without exception educational and statistical experts are city-dwellers) have not guessed at what was hidden by our silence, but it is at last shown up in this book. Personally I am once more unable to agree with the recommendations of these investigators, about the best way to solve this difficulty. I do not think that a different law, or a different set of officials ever go far towards solving any difficulty unless public opinion is changed, and I think it perfectly possible to change public opinion about this matter. But the book has done something of very great value in pulling this difficulty out of the dark corner where we have kept it hidden, and holding it up so that it can no longer be ignored.

Another good example of what this volume does, is its treatment of play. Country people have ignored the necessity to provide play and recreation for country children quite as systematically as the failures of the truant laws; and much more honestly, for as a rule, they have had no notion that there was anything there to ignore. No chapter of this very useful book will be more useful than the one on Rural Recreation. The country-dwelling citizens and local and state officials who, it is to be hoped, will read this report, will find perhaps more new food for thought in that chapter and in the suggestions about play, than in any other part of this reasonable, practical, intelligent and humane volume.

DOROTHY CANFIELD FISHER.

Contributors

DICKINSON S. MILLER is professor of apologetics at the Union Theological Seminary.

MORRIS LLEWELLYN COOKE, consulting engineer, is the author of Academic Industrial Efficiency, Snapping Cords and Our Cities Awake.

MARY CASS CANFIELD is a contributor the The New Republic and to Vanity Fair.

ROYALL SNOW is assistant professor of English at Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, and author of Igdrasil.

NATHANIEL PEFFER, an authority on the Far East, has contributed articles to the Nation, the Century Magazine and other periodicals.

HARRY ELMER BARNES is professor of the history of thought at Clark University.

DOROTHY CANFIELD FISHER is the author of The Montessori Mother; The Bent Twig; Home Fires in France; and The Brimming Cup. She spent three years in France doing war work.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED